

AUG 15 1921
If Dante Were Alive

GENERAL LIBRARY
AUG 15 1921

Yearly Subscription, \$2.50

Single Number, 75 cents

UNIV. OF MICH.

The Sewanee Review

Quarterly

EDITED BY

GEORGE HERBERT CLARKE



July-September, 1921

- | | |
|--|---------------------------|
| I. <i>On the Malabar Coast</i> (a poem) | WILLIAM G. SHAKESPEARE |
| II. <i>If Dante Were Alive</i> | GEORGE MCLEAN HARPER |
| III. <i>Zionism and the Jewish Problem</i> | JOHN PUNNETT PETERS |
| IV. <i>Memories</i> (a poem) | C. FOX SMITH |
| V. <i>Tombelaine</i> | ROWLAND THIRLMERE |
| VI. <i>Thiers and the July Days</i> | JOHN M. S. ALLISON |
| VII. <i>The Picture Land</i> (a poem) | GUY KENDALL |
| VIII. <i>Some Aspects of Matthew Arnold's Poetry</i> | STANLEY T. WILLIAMS |
| IX. <i>Woodcraft</i> (a poem) | KATHLEEN KNOX |
| X. <i>The Southern Attitude Toward Slavery</i> | JOHN DOUGLASS VAN HORNE |
| XI. <i>Croglin Water</i> (a poem) | JOHN HELSTON |
| XII. <i>Unreality in Russian Literature</i> | CLARENCE AUGUSTUS MANNING |
| XIII. <i>Gifts</i> (a poem) | MARJORIE L. C. PICKTHALL |
| XIV. <i>Book Reviews</i> | |

PUBLISHED BY

THE SEWANEE REVIEW, Inc.

AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS OF SEWANEE TENNESSEE

Entered at the postoffice at Sewanee, Tenn., as second-class matter.

Contributors to the July Review

Dr. WILLIAM G. SHAKESPEARE is a physician and surgeon by profession, and is at present stationed in India. His published verse is favorably known.

Dr. GEORGE McLEAN HARPER is Professor of English in Princeton University. The present article commemorates the six hundredth anniversary of Dante's death, which occurs on September 14th, 1921.

Dr. JOHN PUNNETT PETERS is Professor of New Testament Language and Literature in the University of the South.

Miss C. FOX SMITH is a well-known English writer, who has published several volumes of verse.

Mr. JOHN WALKER, whose pen-name is Rowland Thirlmere, is a poet and essayist, living near London. He contributed to the REVIEW for January, 1921, *Reflections upon Revolutions at L'Abbaye de Jumièges*.

Dr. JOHN M. S. ALLISON is Assistant Professor of European History in Yale University. He is writing a Life of Thiers.

Dr. GUY KENDALL is Head Master of University College School, Frognal, Hampstead, London. He has published *The Call, and Other Poems*.

Dr. STANLEY T. WILLIAMS is Assistant Professor of English in Yale University. He contributed to the REVIEW for October, 1920, an essay entitled *Newman's Literary Preferences*.

Miss KATHLEEN KNOX is a writer living in Belfast, Ireland.

Mr. JOHN DOUGLASS VAN HORNE, a Southerner by birth and education, resides in Johnstown, Pennsylvania.

Mr. JOHN HELSTON is an English poet living in London.

Dr. CLARENCE AUGUSTUS MANNING is Lecturer in Slavonic Languages in Columbia University. He has written *A Study of Archaism in Euripides*, etc.

Miss MARJORIE L. C. PICKTHALL is a well-known Canadian writer, living in Victoria, British Columbia.

THE SEWANEE REVIEW

VOL. XXIX]

JULY, 1921

[No. 3

ON THE MALABAR COAST

I remember a great sea breaking on grey sands,
And cocoanut palms that came down nearly to the water,
And children walking with flowers in their hands
Silently, and without laughter.

Through a hot day I watched that shore, and after,
When night walked on the sea and picked her way
From wave to wave, I waited for the moon
As a man for his friend at the end of day. . . .

Distantly through the palms a drum was beating,
And somewhere, far-off voices sang together
A wild, monotonous tune that kept repeating
While I waited for the moon that rose up never.

Then a wind came talking to the palms,
And no voice was there for friendly word with me,
So I lay on the beach with my head on my arms,
Waiting for the moon to rise from the sea.

But she, that is a friend to strangers in far lands
And hospitably welcomes with the same kind face
That once they reached to touch with baby hands
From little white cots in the old home place,
Came not all that night, though I lay on the sands
Longing for a friend, with my face in my hands.

WILLIAM G. SHAKESPEARE.

Bombay, India.

IF DANTE WERE ALIVE

The year of Dante's death, 1321, was in the very heart of the Middle Ages. As far as Christendom extended, the note of that age, notwithstanding all the many harsh discords, was unity. In Western Europe, certainly, there were, broadly speaking, one theology, one visible Church, two or at most three general types of civil government, one system of instruction, one dominant philosophy, and throughout most of that territory one type of land-tenure and military obligation. The memory of Roman unity had not faded, and the hope of attaining it once more was bright. Dante is in no respect so representative of the mediæval mind as in his desire for unity. Towards unity flowed the four main currents of his life.

His political effort may, at a superficial glance, appear to have been made in the direction of a division and not in the interest of unity. He was the author of a treatise, *De Monarchia*, in which he argued for a differentiation between the functions of Church and State,—the Pope to mind things spiritual, and the Emperor to rule in secular affairs. But observe that they were to govern the world jointly, in a union of purpose, though according to the maxim which Dante himself utters: "Quod potest fieri per unum, melius est per unum fieri quam per plura". If the head of the Holy Roman Empire had really established his authority over the whole of Western Europe, including all the petty principalities and city republics of Italy and the clans and kingdoms of the British Isles, with the Pope at his side as the spiritual representative of Christ, there would have been a better chance for unity than with either of these potentates usurping the functions of the other. Dante's political ideal was not realized, but his *De Monarchia* probably had some effect in checking such usurpations and leading to the modern theory that the separation of Church and State is more conducive to concord than a specious and irritating union can ever be.

Dante's effort in the field of philosophy was to demonstrate the unity of revelation with natural and historical truth; in other words, to coördinate Christian theology and the teachings of

Aristotle. He made attempts not only in the sphere of metaphysics and ethics, but even in biology and astronomy, to show that the Bible and Aristotle, used conjointly, could explain all mysteries and furnish an organon or instrument for further research. Aristotle, we must remember, was for Dante, as for mediæval thinkers in general, the supreme authority in science as well as the fountain-head of speculation. He was, in Dante's phrase, "il maestro di color che sanno". Now, however vain it may seem to a modern man to suppose either that Aristotle was an adequate authority in science or that Aristotle's teachings can be reconciled with all of the vast number of remarks made in the Bible upon an infinity of subjects, we must remember that for a period varying from two hundred to four hundred years, according to locality, this union of authorities was supposed to have been established, and that for good or ill it ruled the scholastic world.

Dante's effort in the field of philology was likewise made in the interest of unity. It is safe to say that no other man we have ever heard of, not even Martin Luther, accomplished so much as Dante towards establishing, indeed almost creating, a language. The Greeks, had he done such a work among them, would have given him divine honors, with Orpheus and those other few, who, in Sidney's phrase, were "the first of that country that made pens deliverers of their knowledge to their posterity". In his *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, Dante tells us of his purpose and recounts, in part, the process by which he selected the dialect of Tuscany and elevated it above all other Italian dialects—Bolognese, Roman, Venetian, Apulian, and the rest—as the literary idiom of the peninsula. If ever a man performed a god-like task, it was this; for consider how slowly and by the operation of how many and varied causes languages generally rise to such eminence. Dante thus gave to all Italians who have lived since his time a common literary language. In so doing he opened to the Italian people a hope of intellectual unity and placed in their possession the chief instrument for accomplishing that hope.

The fourth of Dante's great efforts was literary, and here again his purpose was to establish unity. He attempted to

write, and he succeeded in writing, a universal poem,—a poem packed with all the learning of his time, glowing with all the color of his country's beauty and charm, vibrant with the strain of contemporary politics, tumultuous with private passion and family feud, arduous in its pursuit of philosophic truth, vast in design, minute in detail, and all subdued and harmonized to one clear chord,—the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God. It is the chief single source of knowledge about mediæval man. It is still true to Italian character. It is the supreme Christian poem. It is, I believe, the greatest individual work of art created by any one human being. I have no desire to claim for the *Divine Comedy* beauty and charm equal to the beauty and charm of the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*; or moral truth and motive power equal to the moral truth and motive power of the Bible; or vigor, splendor, and variety equal to the vigor, splendor, and variety of Shakespeare's plays; although these qualities it indeed possesses in magnificent profusion. The *Divine Comedy* is remarkable, even among these master-works, for the strict unity which binds into a perfect effect all the attributes, each in good measure, which make Homer and the Bible and Shakespeare glorious. It is the universal poem.

It is unfortunately true that there were many elements of discord at work in the world at the opening of the fourteenth century, and that Dante himself was envenomed with partisan hate and blinded by personal prejudice. These evils were nowhere so devastating as in Italy, and Dante was not only an Italian of the Italians, but a man of genius, and for that reason a man of intense intellectual passion. But his ideal, which he knew to be greater than his genius and purer than his passions, was the ideal of unity, and with all his disappointments, his countenance, when he died, six hundred years ago, may well have been irradiated with the glad knowledge that to a marvellous degree his dream had come true. Although the political and ecclesiastical structure which he endeavored to rear never was quite finished, for this we probably should be thankful. And he no doubt helped mightily to bring to pass, in due season, the unification of Italy. It is true also that the scholastic philosophy, which he illustrated so brilliantly, yet withal so naively, has been re-

duced to dust by "the unimaginable touch of time". But the Italian language, which he chose from among a dozen local dialects and dignified with his poetry, is a living and perpetual testimony to his foresight. His great poem endures, and seems likely to survive the ruins of all the gothic cathedrals and to breathe from its lines "the last enchantments of the Middle Age".

Nearly three years ago we, too, dreamed of unity. Wars were to cease. Nations, those artificial substitutes for real spiritual unions, were to alter their pretensions, and by surrendering a little of their sovereignty were to enter into a larger society and inherit a grander and less precarious life. It was a noble dream, worthy of our best selves. But, cheated by fears, plucked to earth and brought lower, I verily believe, than our true level, by listening to uninspired maxims, timidly accepting commonplace people at their own exorbitant valuation, and supposing that because they are commonplace their voice must be the voice of universal wisdom, we have deliberately chosen discord instead of unity. And so it has come to pass that in no year since 1321, if Dante could have returned to life again, would he have found Christendom less unified than in 1921.

The tendency of Western civilization since the Middle Ages has been towards disruption. I do not say that this has not often been a healthful tendency. What is not fully realized, however, is that the aspiration and the action of men, of leaders fully as much as of masses, have been directed towards a different object from the object dear to the mediæval mind. The object cherished by the mediæval mind was unity; the object most striven for by men of the Renaissance and of the modern time is diversity. Call it what you please—liberty, independence, self-expression, expansion, specialization, progress—the new ideal is exactly opposite to the old. The Revival of Learning disturbed the nice adjustment which the mediæval mind had made between Christian tradition and Greek philosophy, the pagan element of the compound being increased until the equipoise was broken. The Reformation would have been regarded by mediæval Christians as a second fulfillment of the prophecy: "They parted my garments among them, and upon

my vesture did they cast lots"; and they would have lamented that the seamless unity of Christ's Church was destroyed. The shifting of authority from the few to the many, from monarchs and aristocrats to the sovereign people, all that age-long movement which we term the political revolution, a movement which began in the Middle Ages themselves and is still going on,—this too would have shocked the mediæval mind. The separation of the physical and historical sciences from philosophy, and the differentiation of the sciences from one another—processes that marked the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and have been rich in material results—were contrary to mediæval ideas of unity in learning. A modern university would seem to a mediæval scholar something like a department-store without a manager, or like a heterogeneous mass of machinery without motive power or any reference to production or locomotion. "What is it for?" he would ask, and "whither does it tend?" If he were to pick up the catalogue of some general publisher or a copy of the *Times Literary Supplement* (either the London or the New York *Times*) he would say: "This is chaos. There is no order among all these books. They have nothing in common, except commonness, and no particular tendency except a tendency to be particular".

Now, I am by no means inclined to glorify the Middle Ages at the expense of modern civilization. When I read history I find myself almost always on the side of the Reformers, the Revolutionists, the Dissenters, the Apostles of Science. I have faith in Democracy. I am still holding on with both hands, in spite of many cruel disappointments and much pale apprehension, to the revolutionary doctrines of human equality and human perfectibility. I believe the world has made progress and will continue to make progress, and in saying this I am not thinking so much of mechanical improvement, or the combat against time and space, as of spiritual welfare. There is no reason to suppose that men were, in general, better or even happier in the Middle Ages than we were at the opening of the twentieth century.

Nevertheless, it is obvious that a bewildering and inexpressible contrast would appear to Dante if, across the gulf of these six hundred years, he were to revisit the glimpses of the moon. He

would hardly recognize the world we live in as either Christian or civilized. In fact, it would not seem to him a world, or cosmos, at all, but a chaos of meaningless and restless change, with no unity of structure, direction, or purpose. He would entirely disapprove of those features of our life, precisely, in which most men now take the greatest pride. Our arrangements for physical comfort, our mechanical devices, would no doubt interest him, for he had an eye for such things in his own day; but he would, I fancy, regard them as having come between us and God. And when he looked into our political, educational, and religious systems, or fragments of systems and denials of system, he would turn away with condemnation written in the folds of his august brow.

We have made poor use of our eyes and ears and are stupid readers of history if we have not noticed that the rate of change has been much accelerated in recent years. Whether we applaud or regret the tendencies of our age, we must admit that they are increasingly centrifugal and that their velocity is increasing. It behooves us, therefore, to measure, if we can, the force and direction of these tendencies, or we may be swept by them whither we would not.

In order to make these measurements, we must find some point of departure, some place of relatively stable conditions. We should, if possible, go back to some position of unity, from which to estimate the extent of our diversity. There is no point of this kind nearer than the early part of the fourteenth century, and it is a singular advantage that no other period of the world's history has had its culture so accurately and yet broadly described in a single work. A strange thing, is it not, that a poem which professes to narrate a journey through Hell, Purgatory, and Heaven, should be actually a picture of human society in Italy? Strange that a poem whose theme is eternity should be our best means of understanding the fourteenth century! But stranger still is the case if we are right in thinking that no other poem or work of art whatsoever can help us so much to an understanding of our own country and our own times. In land-surveying, as in astronomy, the longer your base-line the more accurate will be your measurement of objects which, through dis-

tance or the intervention of impassable obstacles, are unattainable. So it is with measuring the force and direction of social movements: We can do it only by standing apart from them.

This great reason, among several others, is what gives so rich an educational value to the *Divine Comedy*. Of these other reasons, I need mention only its intrinsic poetical worth and beauty and the fact that it, more fully than any other human creation, reveals the mind and heart of him who made it. As a gross and ready proof of its poetic quality we may take its quotability. It is the most generally quoted of all poems, having great lines for all great occasions, and fine and subtle lines for many particular by-paths of thought and experience. In no respect, however, is it so remarkable as in its being, after all, not so much a work of art as a man speaking: it is Dante himself. Not Homer, not Vergil, not Shakespeare, not Milton, not Molière, so breathe in their works as Dante breathes in his. The great reason, with which we are now concerned, however, might be called its power as prophecy. The action of prophecy is to "rebuken the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgement"; and this action the *Divine Comedy* performs.

Thus it becomes evident that no other single work of literature possesses so high an educational value and should so certainly be included in any programme of advanced education. Its inclusion would be justified from yet another point of view. Modern attempts at education, especially in America, often fail to produce satisfactory results because they are scattering and superficial. They do not provide a centre of effort with a large body of material lying closely packed round that centre, and they do not require a discipline or a mastery of technique sufficiently thorough to enable a student to fight his way through from the circumference to the centre of this body of material. Energy is squandered, and self-command is not attained. The *Divine Comedy* offers itself as a centre towards which a student may work his way by the study of the Italian and Latin languages, the mythology of antiquity, the Bible, the Aristotelian metaphysics and ethics, the *Summa* of Thomas Aquinas, and the history of Christendom down to the year 1300, and then out again from centre to circumference, through the æsthetic, scho-

lastic, political, and religious revolutions of the Renaissance and the last three centuries to a consideration of every large modern question that is not scientific. I do not say that a selection of the best Greek literature or of the best Latin literature might not serve the purpose as well. They have so served in the past, in the way they were taught in the English universities. I merely wish to suggest that the *Divine Comedy* has the advantage of being a single work, to equal the scope of which you would have to pile, for your Greek centre, Plato upon Euripides and Euripides on Homer, and then add a dome of clouds and lightning for Aristophanes; and your Latin centre would be at least equally composite. If a student will attach himself to Dante for three or four or five years, reading up to him and into him, and then away from him, trying to place himself in Dante's age and country, and then applying to modern conditions some of Dante's wisdom, he will be a well-educated man, except on that side alone which science affects.

It is the general complaint of the headmasters of private schools, the principals of public high schools, and the presidents of colleges, that education lacks a centre. They have reluctantly given up the centre which classical literature afforded and are afraid to adopt the one that natural science offers. They have here and there tried the ideal of public service, making the hub of the wheel consist of "civil government", or sociology, or economics, but the experiment fails because the hub is not big enough to accommodate all the spokes that a perfect wheel requires. Considering the immensity of scientific knowledge which has to be reckoned with, no one wheel is enough. Modern education must move forward on an axle sustained by two wheels, one constructed of scientific studies, the other of humanistic. I will back the teachers of science to construct their wheel on sound principles within the next thirty years; but unless the teachers of the humanities are willing to return to the old classical model they must look for a substitute. In case they think, as they apparently do, that the youth of to-day are too unmanageable or too feeble-minded for the discipline of the ancient classics, they will find no substitute so well fitted for the purpose as the *Divine Comedy*. In all American colleges and

universities, as the statistics of elective choices show, the attempt is being made to find one centre of humanistic training in English literature and another in a jumble of historico-politico-economic studies. The attempt fails in both directions, because in neither is there a sufficiently simple and yet difficult block of material at the heart of the subject. Dante furnishes such a block for education.

In religion, likewise, a fresh and sound impulse would be given to modern society by the study of Dante. The impact between the fluctuating modern mind and Dante's rigid theology would be tremendous. In Dante is made manifest not only the glory of historic orthodoxy, but its incompatibility with the deepest and sweetest human morality; orthodoxy would be finally shattered by the touch of those sympathies which the heart of modern man cherishes as its real religion, and at last we should know where we stand with reference to the "rock of ages" on which Dante so firmly placed his feet. It is hardly to be supposed that the soft, flexible, and wary religious spirit of to-day, beautiful and variegated as a butterfly, ambitious as an eagle, tender as a dove, will settle permanently on that rock; rather will it learn what to avoid. At any rate, an acquaintance with something so stern and stationary would be instructive.

It is in the field of politics, however, that the study of Dante would be most fruitful in wisdom and entertainment. The amusement would be of that dry Aristophanic quality which tends to produce not laughter so much as grinding of teeth. There is joy in knowledge, but the first knowledge that comes to a disciple of Dante as he surveys the scene of contemporary politics is bitter. Our young people are complaining because all the great preachers and every living poet worthy of the name are telling them that this is an evil world, and that an abyss yawns ahead into which we shall all plunge, unless——. The happiness natural to their youth is being poisoned. Well, I am afraid Dante would hold the cup still closer to their lips. And we must drink it out before it can be refilled, with the water of hope and strength. Dante's conception of the Kingdom of God as the goal of political and social life is unrelenting, with all its promise and splendor. No disciple of Dante can take a frivolous, easy-going view

of social and political conditions. He can neither rest in selfish individualism nor trust in a dream of coöperative ease. The seriousness of Dante, his clear perception of the temporary character of all outward show and sensual satisfaction, lift his disciples above vulgarity. They walk in the light of eternity, neither strutting nor creeping, for they have some perception of the soul's worth. In their lighter mood, they wonder what Dante, were he to come alive again, would write about America to-day. Whom of us, what living individuals and what historical personages would he consign to Hell, and whom to Purgatory, and whom to Paradise? What ingenious and appropriate punishments would he invent for the grafter, the profiteer, the corrupt politician? What destiny of undying scorn would he devise for the voiceless neuter? What grim smile would he bestow, like a plague, upon the ostentatious upstart and the idle or much-divorced rich? How surely would he see through the designs of the Irish agitators in America and how clearly expose their dealings with our demagogues! In his *Paradise* there is the Rose of the Blessed, every petal the throne of a saint, and all as definitely fixed and assigned as are the desks in the United States Senate chamber, but otherwise occupied. He would not hesitate to evoke a corresponding pageant in a new *Inferno*. Would he not repeat, with reference to our failure to enter the League of Nations, those bitter words which he applied to the Pope Celestine who preferred his own comfort to the welfare of the Church?—

"Guardai, e vidi l'ombra di colui
Che fece per viltate il gran rifiuto."

I fancy his American epic would consist of two parts, which might be called the Cup of Purgation and the Cup of Healing. Whether proffered by a poet or by some consuming plague of war and disaster, we cannot put by the Cup of Purgation if we are ever to be found worthy to drink the Cup of Healing.

GEORGE MCLEAN HARPER.

Princeton University.

ZIONISM AND THE JEWISH PROBLEM

The Jewish problem has become within the last few months rather angrily acute both in England and in this country. It has long been a familiar problem on the continent of Europe, in Russia, Poland, Rumania, Germany, and even in France, as witness the Dreyfus case, and now we are experiencing it. The so-called protocols have been published in England and in this country by reputable papers, and high-toned publishers have issued the volumes of those who would warn the world of a Jewish peril. This has called forth from Jewish sources protests, and there have been recriminations and denunciations; but especially it is the Zionist Jews who have been engaged in this warfare, for the Jewish problem is principally the result of Zionism, and the attempt at the practical realization of political Zionism in the mandate under which England has taken Palestine has brought it to the fore.

On sentimental grounds there has long been a tendency among English-speaking people to sympathize with the Jewish religious dream of restoration to Palestine and consequent revival of the ancient glory of Jewry. Sympathy with this dream was elicited by the persistent hope and faith which through manifold vicissitudes and much suffering had enabled the Jew to maintain a separate existence awaiting its fulfilment. That vision of restored glory had kept alive a spirit of idealism in the souls of a people otherwise steeped in a crass and sordid materialism, and the glamor of it, like a jewel in the mire, appealed to the imagination. Affected by such sentiment, few have examined the Jewish claim to Palestine historically, or considered it in its relation to the similar sentimental claims of the great body of Occidental and Oriental Christians, of Mohammedan believers everywhere, or to the practical claims of the present inhabitants of Palestine.

Historically, the Hebrews acquired Palestine by the usual process. Lusting after the good things of others, the Hebrews invaded the country of the Canaanites, following the worldwide method pursued by countless numbers of other peoples, who, with greater or less cruelty robbing and despoiling those who

had industriously tilled the land and accumulated wealth, have possessed themselves of that land and that wealth. The record of the contest as handed down in Hebrew tradition is rather gruesome; not more so, however, than that of other similar conquests, and in point of fact less so than appears at first sight from the Old Testament record. The Hebrews to a large extent united with the previous population, adopting their language and much of their civilization, and taking over many of their shrines, with their religious, political and other customs and traditions. In places, Hebrew and Canaanite amalgamated by intermarriage, in others they dwelt side by side in amicable relations. In some there was perpetual hostility, and in some the Canaanite was altogether blotted out. The whole land was never fully possessed, even at the time of David. He, however, established a Hebrew kingdom in Palestine and put the Canaanites not already amalgamated under tribute, and ultimately by victorious raids and wars the neighboring peoples also, thus creating what may be called an empire, covering almost all of the territory from the borders of Egypt to the river Euphrates. David's empire laid the foundation of that dream which has come down among orthodox Jews to this day, of the reestablishment of a great kingdom of Israel, possessing all David's conquests, with much more besides, and dominating the world. David's empire lasted for two generations. It began to disintegrate under Solomon, and under Solomon's son all the remaining tributaries threw off the Hebrew yoke, while the Hebrews themselves divided into two parts, the larger part, and the more advanced in culture and religion, constituting the Israelite kingdom, whose descendants are the modern Samaritans; the smaller part, chiefly David's own tribe, the kingdom of Judah, occupying a tiny territory about Jerusalem, not so large as a fair-sized county in this country or in England.

This petty kingdom of Judah endured for three hundred and fifty years, sometimes independent, sometimes a subordinate or tributary state, and then Jerusalem was destroyed and the better part of its nobles, priests and skilled artisans deported to Babylonia, while others fled to Egypt, leaving only a peasant population to possess a moiety of the territory of Judah immediately

about the ruins of the ancient capital. Largely through the influence of Ezekiel and some fellow-priests the exiles in Babylonia maintained their integrity, and half a century later such of their descendants as would, were permitted and helped by the Persian conqueror, Cyrus, to return from Babylonia to their homeland and rebuild Jerusalem and the Temple. Few took advantage of this opportunity. They could not or would not make the sacrifice or undergo the hardships involved in the transfer of their domicile from the rich and safe Babylonia to the poor and half barbarous Judæa. So they developed a theory that some day their God would transport them and their wealth together to a transformed Palestine, and continued in Babylonia to bewail and pity themselves as the *Galutha*, or Captivity, making amends for their failure to return by a visit or pilgrimage once in a lifetime, by money contributions, and by a painstaking application to and development of the theory of their religion, and especially of a law of exclusivism which should keep them separate from the people among whom they lived, until the Lord should intervene to carry them back in triumph to Jerusalem. This theory their superior education, their greater wealth, and their material support enabled them to impress upon their compatriots in Palestine, until at last there was built up there a religious community, with the Temple as its centre, where priests might sacrifice and pray for their brethren throughout the world, all of whom were bound together by this holy law of separation from the peoples among whom they lived, counting Jerusalem as their future home, to which they should sometime be wafted from the four corners of the earth by the power of the Lord, who would also make Palestine a land flowing with milk and honey, and establish there a king of David's line, to avenge them on all who had oppressed them and to establish a mighty dominion. This was Judaism, and with the establishment of this ideal came into being the people who called themselves Jews and to whom we give that name in distinction from Hebrew or Israelite. Judæa itself constituted under Persian rule a church rather than a state, autonomous, religiously and socially, although obligated to recognize the Persian suzerain in its sacrifices and its prayers, politically and economically a part

of the Persian empire, ruled by Persian officials. Under this system Judaism grew and thrived, Jerusalem became rich and prosperous, and Jews multiplied and waxed fat and influential in all parts of the empire.

But in Judaism there were at war two principles, the one the principle of rigid exclusivism, the development of a legalism which should completely mark off the Jew from all other peoples, prohibiting marriage with them and social intercourse. This had its centre in the Captivity, that is, among the Jews in Babylonia, but became dominant in Judæa, from the time of Ezra, forcing among other things the breach with Israel or the Samaritans. The other principle is that which we call the prophetic principle, which found expression in the prophets from Amos onward, and in its highest form in the great Prophet of the restoration,¹ who set forth the view that Israel might not live for itself, that its dispersion among the Gentiles was for the beneficent purpose of revealing to the Gentile the glory and love of the one true God and uniting Jew and Gentile together in the service of that God. The former party looked to the reestablishment of David's kingdom and their triumph over the nations before whom they must now cringe. The latter looked to a kingdom of God upon earth the basis of which should be love and service, and in which Jew and Gentile should be united. The former party prevailed, but in the sacred book that was adopted as a guide of life for the Jews, both the Law and the Prophets were included, the former being given, however, much the higher place and counted the supreme authority.

Religious national exclusivism, it should be said, was not originally peculiar to the Jew. It was the property of practically all ancient religions, but under the influence, first of the Persian empire, then of the great Hellenizing movement resulting from the conquests of Alexander the Great, and finally of the establishment of the Roman Empire, this older conception of the separateness of peoples one from another, and the combination of their religion with their state in this separateness, was broken down, in some places altogether, in others in part. Only

¹ Isaiah, 40-66.

the Jew resisted with all his might this tendency, and developed his Law for that purpose. So persuasive, however, was Greek civilization that to it Judaism almost succumbed, and there was a period, at the beginning of the second century B. C., when it seemed as though the Jew was in a fair way to be Hellenized and to lose his exclusiveness. The attempt of Antiochus Epiphanes to expedite this by a religious persecution led to that glorious outburst of national spirit under Mattathias, and his heroic sons, Judas, Jonathan and Simon, which restored the Jewish state and nation and revived in new form and greater power the old hope of the restoration of David's glorious kingdom and the triumph of the Jew over all the world. From the Maccabean rebellion onward to the final destruction of Jerusalem under Hadrian—a period of almost three centuries—the Jewish world was in continual ebullition. On the one hand was developed to its ultimate degree the doctrine of national and racial exclusivism, connecting itself with the study of the Law; on the other hand, connecting itself more particularly with the study of the Prophets, there developed revelation or apocalypse, the doctrine of the wonderful last days, which lifted men's souls out of earth, inspiring them with visions of heavenly glory and inciting them to heroic deeds or atrocious acts of fanaticism. Jew persecuted Jew in the attempt to bring about a holy uniformity after his opinion, and so insure the expected divine intervention, and those that remained were knit more closely together in their conviction that they were the chosen of God, especially privileged and gifted, intended by Him to rule the world, and in their hatred and despite of the Gentile, who opposed God and His plan for them. There resulted first the insurrection which brought about the Jewish war and the capture of Jerusalem by Titus in 70 A. D., and consequent anti-Jewish legislation and prejudice. This in its turn inflamed Jewish hatred, and led, when the opportunity offered because of the Parthian war in Trajan's reign (when the empire was hard-pressed, and the provinces were denuded of soldiers to protect the frontiers), to the uprising of the Jews wherever they were numerous, and their massacre with horrible cruelties of the peaceful and unarmed populations in Cyrene, Egypt and Cyprus; to their rebellion in

Mesopotamia; and finally to that last heroic and horrible revolt in Palestine under the leadership of Bar-Kochba, whom they had acclaimed Messiah, which it taxed the whole power of mighty Rome slowly to suppress, and the complete destruction of Jerusalem by Hadrian in 132 A. D. It was these experiences which caused Rome, generally so tolerant, and which had formerly granted the Jews special privileges and exemptions, to treat them with peculiar rigor, especially on account of the danger lurking in their hope of a restored kingdom of David, with Jerusalem as its centre. They were forbidden to come within sight of their ancient holy city, and to expropriate and in their estimation defile it, there was built on its ruins a Roman town, and a Roman temple to Jupiter was erected where formerly the Jewish temple stood. Further, they were subjected to repressive and restrictive legislation touching their peculiar rites and practices; but with invincible persistency and faith the Jew adhered to his ritual and his hopes. This prolonged period of fierce and fanatical struggle against the Gentile intensified the Jew's own sense of alienation from and superiority to his fellow-men; on the other hand, it inevitably developed in the minds of the Roman authorities and of the populations under their rule the conception of the Jew as an enemy to the state, who must be kept under and oppressed for the welfare of the community, a conception which was passed on as a heritage to future generations. On both sides the sins of the parents were to be handed down to and visited upon the children for generations of generations.

It was during the last hundred years of this period of Jewish ebullition and outbursts that a great schism developed in Judaism itself,—Christianity, a minority movement which connected itself with the prophetic, as over against the legalistic, heritage of Jewry. Of this movement a distinguished Jewish scholar, the late Professor Morris Jastrow, Jr., of Philadelphia, has written:—

“Christianity broke at its foundation, with Jewish nationalism. It definitely cut the thread that bound religion to the limitations inherent in associating religion with the group. The significance of the teachings of Jesus lies just in this circumstance, that he brought the . . . concep-

tion of religion as preached by the Prophets and which made religion solely a matter between the individual and his conscience more definitely and in an uncompromising form into the foreground. It is an error to suppose that the Jews rejected the religious *teachings* of Jesus. They *could* not have done so, for these teachings breathed the same spirit as those of their own Prophets, but the weight of tradition and of their established attitude of mind, attached to the pressure of the religious conception current about them, was sufficiently great to prevent them from accepting the *implications* of the position taken by Jesus, though even these were identical with those of the Prophets. The Jews could not conceive of a Messiah who was not also a nationalist. Jesus could not conceive of Judaism except as detached from Zionist longings—and so the inevitable break took place."²

The break became acute when, especially under St. Paul's leadership, the Christian Church proclaimed the equality in Christianity of Jew and Gentile. This aroused the Jew to bitter hostility and an attitude of violent persecution. To him the Christian was a renegade and a traitor in the camp who, in the dire need of the nation to stand together against the world, took sides with the foe, and stabbed the defenders of the ramparts from behind. This animosity was naturally not diminished by the fact that the Christians claimed to be the true Israel, inheritors of all those promises made in the Old Testament, which, however, they spiritualized and detached from their merely local and temporal significance as belonging to Jerusalem and Palestine. The Christian's new Jerusalem and his new twelve tribes of Israel were a world conception. Christianity was the heir of the Prophets; Judaism of the Law. Each accepted the Old Testament as Bible, but ultimately each added to it a new interpretation, constituting a new Bible, the essential Bible of either side: the Christian, the New Testament, the Jew, the Talmud. The bitterness of the Jews against the Christians led them to endeavor to bring Christianity within the toils of the Roman law and to

² Jastrow: *Zionism and the Future of Palestine*. This is by all odds the best book on Zionism which I have seen, and I have been greatly indebted to it in the preparation of this article.

procure its persecution by the Roman state, as later orthodox Judaism invoked state aid in the persecution of the Karaites, and then of the followers of the great Maimonides, which reacted also against themselves. The Christian on his side developed no little bitterness against the Jew, as may be seen from Paul's Epistles and from Revelation, where the Jews are called the "Synagogue of Satan". When the Christian conquered the Roman state he was in his turn conquered by the spirit of that wonderful empire, its administrative and legal methods, and its *Volksgeist*, its customs, habits and prejudgments. Christianity adopted the anti-Christian position of the identification of Church and State, with the concomitant principle of persecution, and, with the double prejudice inherited from its own experiences and those of Rome, the Jews became in their turn the victims of persecution by this perverted Christianity.

From the separation of Christianity from Judaism dates, one may say, the orthodox Jewish faith, the four cornerstones of which are: (1) belief in one God, (2) belief in a Messiah who shall redeem God's chosen, (3) belief that the Jews are God's chosen people set apart and bound to keep themselves separate from all nations of the earth, and (4) the belief that God will ultimately gather his chosen people in Palestine, restore the Holy Temple, service, sacrifices and all, and the Jewish kingdom and priesthood. The former two principles or beliefs are not, the latter are, peculiar to the Jews. While here and there the Jews have followed false Messiahs, or established temporal states by force of arms, in which cases they have shown themselves intolerant and persecutors, yet in general it may be said that this Zionism, which has been the belief of the Jews through all the ages since Christianity has been dominant, has not, for many centuries certainly, directly endangered or embroiled the state by its endeavor to realize its expectation of a return to Palestine and the establishment there of a Jewish state. They have expected that this would be brought about, not by human agency, but by a direct intervention of God. While the Jewish Church and nation were in their minds one, the nation was in abeyance, the church only functioned.

Because, however, of their point of view that they were a chosen people, separate and bound to keep themselves separate in blood and customs from all about them, the Jews constituted an unassimilable mass wherever they found themselves, and have been on that account equally obnoxious to Roman paganism, to Christianity and to Islam. For ordinary purposes their attitude has seemed to the rest of the world to be that of the famous grace: "God bless me and my wife, my son John and his wife, us four and no more". This position rendered persecution and religious-racial prejudice inevitable. The persecution which the Jews suffered was in some part religious, but chiefly political, economic and social. The Jew resisted with singular stubbornness, and the results were, on the whole, worse for the persecutor than for the persecuted. Jewish racial pride and religious intolerance were intensified, the latter displaying itself in bitter persecution, so far as their position permitted, of all apostates, the former in their almost pathetic boastfulness in the success of those of Jewish stock, even though renegades, as an evidence of the inherent superiority of the race. The Jews were bound more and more closely together, constituting an international religious-racial unit, inside which they developed singularly beautiful conditions of trust and mutual helpfulness, and an idealism in certain regards very noble. As the opportunity for physical achievement was denied them, mental qualities took their place, which made them in the ordinary competition of life, and in the business world particularly, more than a match for their oppressors. On the other hand, they developed certain offensive habits of servility and that trickery and chicanery which such conditions will produce in any race, which have been the ground of much of the social objection which the Christian feels toward the Jew. But after all has been said which can be said to palliate or explain the persecution and oppression of the Jew through the Christian ages, the chief blame therefor must rest upon the Christian, because his was the position and consequent responsibility of power, and further because he professed principles which made his conduct the more damnable. The relation of Christian to Jew through the 1,600 years of Christian rule is not a pretty memory, and the

Christian world suffered the inevitable in the degradation of its moral fibre, and in the destruction of some of the elements most desirable in the progress of civilization, culture and religion, of all which things Exhibit A is Spain, where Jewish persecution was carried to a terrible extreme.

It was toward the beginning of the last century that a new movement made itself felt in Judaism, as a consequence of that new movement in the Christian world which expressed itself in the French Revolution and the establishment of the American Republic, spreading everywhere new conceptions of liberty and freedom. With our own country in the lead there came for the Jew political emancipation, gradually extending from the west eastward, made effective as far as Vienna and Berlin by the middle of the last century. As a result of this political emancipation and the removal of the civic disabilities under which they had labored for so many centuries, some Jews began to lose the consciousness of being a separate political unit, and there arose in Judaism a movement to adapt the external character of Judaism to these new conditions. This was Reformed Judaism, conceived by Mendelssohn in the eighteenth century, and brought to birth by freedom in the nineteenth. It moved the ethical ideas of the Hebrew prophets into the foreground, as over against the ritual and the ceremonial of legalism. Its adherents sought to be true citizens of the country in which they found themselves, following in this the recommendations of the prophet Jeremiah to the Jews in Babylonia 2,500 years earlier. The essence of reformed Judaism was the dissociation of religion and nationality. It would separate Church and State, breaking all national and racial barriers, and making religion the life of the individual, according to the dictates of his own conscience. Israel would be the chosen people, not in the sense of possessing a tribal deity separating them from the rest of the world, and of looking for special privileges from that deity, but as especially gifted with the knowledge of the true God and therefore with the solemn obligation, imposed by their historical position, to spread the doctrine of Divine unity and to exemplify the teachings of their religion by their conduct in life, not merely toward their fellow-Jews but toward all men. This is

beautifully set forth in the words of a prayer contained in the *Abodah Israel*:—

"Thou hast chosen us from among all nations, and in Thy love hast assigned unto us the priestly mission of spreading the knowledge of Thy Holy Name, so that we may not alone perform Thy commandments, but consecrate ourselves to Thy service."³

This new position and new opportunity of the Jew produced the inevitable reaction. The newly arrived always attains a self-consciousness which asserts itself in an aggressiveness and bumptiousness obnoxious to those who arrived before. This is true of both individuals and races. In the industrial and social world, where it is a phenomenon so common that it has found abundant expression in literature, it is answered by snubs and a species of ostracism; in the political world, by more overt action. Where it is a race or nation, and not an individual, raised or liberated which expresses its self-consciousness at a new arrival, the expression becomes more obnoxious and the response more emphatic. If religious or racial differences mark off the newly arrived, religio-racial prejudice manifests itself, always most emphasized, of course, where these newly arrived constitute a large element of the population, in which case the old possessors are instinctively drawn together to battle for their place and their integrity. Unfortunately, just at this time the Germans also began to develop first a national and then a race consciousness, a development enormously accelerated by the victories of 1866 and 1870. The consequence was *Teutonism*, which ultimately resulted in a conception by the German of his race and its mission strikingly similar to that of the Jew. This new German race-pride and Jewish self-consciousness led to the Berlin *Judenhetze* of 1880-'81 and the organization of Anti-Semitism. This was not religious in its inception, the leaders being rather anti-religious Teutonists and Wagnerites. The dominant position of Germany ensured the spread of Anti-Semitism,

³It should be said that the older Hebrew prayer from which this English form was adapted by the late Rabbi Jastrow does not represent the same noble humanitarian aspiration.

as of the nationalistic race movement. It naturally manifested itself in its worst form in Russia, where the Jews were massed in great numbers, namely, in pogroms, for the same reason that race prejudice against the Negro manifests itself in the southern part of the United States in lynchings. The solid mass of the Jews seemed to constitute a political and economic menace, which the relatively ignorant and unprogressive Russians knew how to combat only by violence. In Russia, moreover, Judaism manifested itself in its crudest and most unmitigated form, not only in its practical application of the Golden Rule to the Jewish neighbor alone, but in its distinct doctrinal exception of the Gentile from the scope of that rule. On the other hand, in Russia as nowhere else, there were emancipated Jews who had broken loose from all religion, and rebelled against the whole social-economical system which had so oppressed them, anarchists and revolutionaries, often men and women of marked ability. On the Russian side there was an ignorant and superstitious piety among the masses, easily inflamed to fury against enemies of the faith by a corrupt bureaucracy, which dreaded progress in Church or State. Hence the infamous May Laws and the pogroms, which began to scatter Jewish refugees from Russia throughout the world.

The effort to provide for the Jews coming out of Russia and the effort to protect from persecution the Jews remaining in Russia brought together Jews of East and West as never before. It was this effort which developed economic Zionism. What should be done with all these Jews coming out of Russia? They had been separated from the soil for centuries. They had lived within the pale and in ghettos. They were to a considerable extent parasitic. It was necessary to introduce them to industrialism and agriculture. The former they took to more or less naturally, the latter unwillingly, and yet the wisest Jewish leaders considered it of the first importance to bring back a part at least of the Jewish race to the soil.

Attempts of all sorts were made to establish Jewish agricultural colonies in this country and in South America. Proposals were made looking to the settlement of Jews in East Africa and in Egypt; and colonies were established in Palestine. This was an

economic and philanthropic Zionism, a movement with which Jews everywhere sympathized and Christians of every sort. It did not seek to colonize Jews in Palestine with the idea of claiming Palestine as the homeland of the Jews, the chosen people who are entitled to dispossess all others, to take possession of that land and to rule the world; but it was felt by Jew and Christian alike to be a proper thing to colonize refugees from persecution in a land which had for them both historical and sacred associations. There seemed something infinitely touching and lovely in bringing them back in that way. As in the old days of the release from the Babylonian captivity, there were few who actually returned to Palestine. The great bulk of the Jews brought out of Russia sought homes in Europe or the Americas, and especially in our own country.

This contact of the Jews of the East and West strengthened the feeling of race solidarity, and even agnostic Jews who had abandoned Judaism began to realize anew the bond of race kinship. Numerous societies of one sort and another sprang up here and there seeking to solve the new problems which arose, to remold Judaism or to secure the rights of Jews, and thus prepared the way for the third and present phase of Zionism, racial-national or political Zionism. This was a further development of race self-consciousness, connecting itself naturally with the general movement of racial rehabilitation which made itself felt toward the close of the last century throughout the world, beginning in Germany with Teutonism. On the large scale, there were Teutonism and the Pan-Slavonic movements; on a smaller scale, the Cymric and Celtic movements. Enthusiasts and faddists were trying everywhere to find some little race whose language, racial traditions and racial integrity might be exploited or restored. Germany stretched out her arms into this country to grip her emigrants who were settled here and make them no longer Americans but Teutons, or, if Americans, at least Teutons first. It was with Teutonism that racial Zionism had its closest affinities. The leader of this new racial or political movement was Herzl, a journalist of Vienna. A Jew by race, not by religion, finding himself socially at a disadvantage, he came to believe that he and others similarly situated were hampered in the

fulfillment of their aspirations by racial prejudice on the part of the Christian majority. Convinced that even though the Jew were to become Christian, he would be regarded as a Jew because his race had no national home, he reached the conclusion that the only method of breaking down prejudice was to reunite those who were Jews by race only, as well as those who were Jews by religion, in one great nationality, securing for them a homeland somewhere. This homeland would, in his opinion, exalt their honor and procure respect in whatever foreign country they might live, precisely as Germans or Italians or Frenchmen living in England and America, though aliens in those countries, are respected because they have the protection of a national homeland. Herzl displayed a remarkable ability in urging his claim. It appealed to the self-consciousness of a great number of racial Jews who, like himself, were galled by a prejudice against them which they did not know how to overcome and against which, therefore, they welcomed any quick-cure panacea, and he achieved speedy success. The first Zionist congress was held in 1897, and from that time the movement developed rapidly. It fell in with the dominant racial movement which was sweeping the world. It expressed that something which appealed to men who, become conscious of power and strength, found themselves hampered in taking the places they believed were theirs; it harmonized with the philanthropic appeal to aid oppressed Jews and give them a home; and it touched a sentiment rooted in ancestral tradition which powerfully appealed to all religious Jews, and which many of those who had practically cast off Jewish orthodoxy could not escape from,—a sentiment which Disraeli has expressed in the words put in the mouth of the high priest in his novel *Alroy*:—

“You ask me what I wish? My answer is the land of promise. You ask me what I wish? My answer is Jerusalem. You ask me what I wish? My answer is the temple. All we have forfeited, all we have yearned for, all for which we have fought, our beauteous country, our holy creed, our simple manners and our ancient customs.”

How powerful was this latter appeal of sentiment can be seen by the frequent citation of these words of Disraeli both by agnostic Zionists, and by Zionists of Reformed Judaism, neither

of whom can possibly, one would suppose, desire the restoration of a theocratic state under the Jewish law, or of the Temple with its sacrifices.

Not being Jews by religion Herzl and his first followers were ready to establish this Zion anywhere where land could be obtained, and entered into negotiations with the English government for a tract of land in East Africa. But the sentimental appeal of Palestine was so strong that the idea of any other country had shortly to be abandoned, and before Herzl's death in 1904 this general principle was adopted by the Zionist Congress: "The object of Zionism is to establish for the Jewish people a publicly and legally assured home in Palestine". The Zionism here referred to is a definitely organized international movement governed by a congress and a committee. Its purpose is to strengthen and develop race-consciousness among the Jewish *nation*, for so they designate all people of Jewish race in all nations throughout the world, binding them together by a revival of their ancient language, a study of their literature and a community of interests, and to provide as a homeland for this Jewish *nation*, Palestine, to which their ancient traditions look. This is to be the heart and centre of Judaism throughout the world, and, wherever the Jew may live or have his being, it is hoped to infuse him from this centre with the national life and the national intelligence.

The great and evident danger of this movement is the development of a race allegiance paramount to the national, and it was a sense of this danger which led a body of prominent Jewish citizens of this country to present to President Wilson, by Congressman Julius Kahn, for transmission to the Peace Conference at Paris on March 4, 1919, a protest "against such a political segregation of the Jews in Palestine or elsewhere", first, "because the Jews are dedicated heart and soul to the welfare of the countries in which they dwell under free conditions. All Jews repudiate every suspicion of a double allegiance, but to our minds it is necessarily implied in and cannot by any logic be eliminated from the establishment of a sovereign state for the Jews in Palestine". The second objection is to the unfortunate effect such "political segregation of Jews would have

on the millions of Jews who would be unable to migrate to Palestine from those states where a strong prejudice already exists against them". The establishment of a Jewish State will manifestly increase that prejudice and serve in such states "as a new justification for additional repressive legislation". The multitudes who remain would be subjected to greater discrimination or persecution than before. The third objection is to the serious danger of sanguinary conflicts with the present inhabitants of the land and their co-religionists which the proposed establishment of such a state is sure to involve. The fourth objection is that "the re-establishment in Palestine of a distinctively Jewish state" is "utterly opposed to the principles of democracy which it is the avowed purpose of the World's Peace Conference to establish". The fifth objection, which has been keenly felt also by orthodox Jews, is that it would substitute a merely national bond for "the bond of common religious principles and experiences".

Supplementing objections two and three,—it may be observed that Palestine has been for a longer time in possession of the Moslems than it ever was in possession of the Jew or of the Hebrew race. The present inhabitants of the land claim its possession with as good right as the inhabitants of any country in the world; and not only that, Palestine is a holy country to the Moslem and to the Christian as much as to the Jew. Christians have occupied it and fought and bled for the possession of its holy sites, and the Christian has left far more marks of occupation and cultivation on the land than did the Jew. In normal times tens of thousands of pilgrims of both religions visit its religious sites every year. The Christians especially have invested immense funds in the land for religious and educational purposes in connection with those holy sites and the pilgrims who visit them, and the number of Christian and Moslem dead who lie buried within sight of Jerusalem, in the hope of bettering their chance in the hereafter, is greater than the number of Jews whose graves cover the slopes of Olivet. For every Jew who has a sentimental claim to Palestine as the land of his forefathers and of his faith, there are hundreds of Christians and Moslems who with some similar sentiment make a like claim upon the land. To plant

a Zionist State there is to run great risk of religious turmoil, and to invite grave perils to those who make such settlement.

While the dominant control of the Zionist party is at present in the hands of those who are not religious but merely racial Jews, and while the movement is in itself political, the glamor of it has appealed to considerable numbers of the religious Jews, both orthodox and reformed, and the number affected by that appeal seems to be on the increase, as a result of the "Zionist Mandate" accepted by England from the Peace Conference. One can understand, without approving, the appeal which a Zionist State makes to the Jew who believes he is one of a race chosen by God, marked off from the rest of the world as a peculiar people, to whom God gave the land of Canaan as his people's possession and Jerusalem as their holy city, appointing the Temple as the place of His dwelling in their midst, where they are to offer sacrifices to Him, and whence He is sometime to manifest Himself in glory, subduing their enemies and making them dominant over them. It is difficult to comprehend how a Zionist State can appeal to those more modern Jews who believe in Judaism as a religious, ethical force only, for Zionism would make religion dependent on locality, creating a holy city, which in the common experience of all religions everywhere has always resulted in the creation of an unholy community; and in point of fact, such Jews are in general opposed to Zionism. The establishment of a Zionist State on the old orthodox basis—and the orthodox Jews in the end are in the vast majority, and it is they largely, and not the agnostics and the theoretical Zionists, who are returning and who will return to Palestine—is to run the risk of a revival on an enormous scale of the old hostile attitude of the Jew against the world and the world against the Jew, which brought about the awful tragedies of the past. The development of race-consciousness and a peculiar obligation to Palestine, at which the merely political and racial Zionists aim, is, it may be added, a duplicate of that Teutonism from which the world has so sadly suffered in the recent past. The result of such a development must be inevitably in the end to make the Jews bad citizens of the United States or of any other country and to keep alive and increase that hostility to the Jew which results not so much

from difference of religion as from the pronounced and obtrusive differences of race, nationality and political allegiance.

The experiment of the Zionist homeland is now being tried. It is too early to determine fully how it will work, but it is at least of interest to consider its manifestations so far. My earliest contact with Zionism and Zionist influences in Palestine dates from 1902. When I first visited Palestine, in 1890, the Jews in Jerusalem were almost exclusively of old oriental Sephardic families. Jerusalem was then still the old Jerusalem within the walls. There were no houses without. Jewish colonization, economic and philanthropic in character, had just then begun on the Sharon plain, but what little there was in the way of colonization was a feeble, unsuccessful exotic—an attempt to replace the persecuted Jews of Russia on the land, where, however, the Jew, unused to manual and especially farm labor, sat under an umbrella to protect himself from the sun and engaged native Syrians to do the work. On my next visit, in 1902, more colonies had been planted, and a serious effort was being made to turn the Jewish colonists into farmers. The majority of the Jews who had come to Palestine, however, were settled about Jerusalem, and the new Jerusalem without the walls was larger, in space at least, than the old Jerusalem within. The Alliance Israélite had developed there splendid schools to teach agriculture, and manual and industrial arts. I was urgently solicited by the management to visit and inspect these schools. Here I found Jew, Moslem and Christian working side by side without prejudice. This was, in my judgment, the best work of any sort being done in Palestine, for two reasons: first, these schools were teaching the dignity and the worth of manual labor, which the oriental of all sorts had theretofore despised, regarding it as unworthy of any man of intelligence or capacity; secondly, because they brought Moslem, Christian and Jew together on a plane of common work and common worth, the most valuable agent for the breaking down of those ancient prejudices, religious, racial and social, which have been the curse and the bane of the land. I was asked to put this down in writing because, I was told, great pressure was being exerted—I regret to say, especially from America—to prevent the management from continuing

this particular work of teaching Jew, Christian and Moslem on the same plane, the demand being that the Jew should not be brought into such contact with the Moslem and the Christian, and that he alone should be trained, that he might not be infected, as it were, by the others, and that they might not be prepared to compete with him for possession of the land. This spirit I met in a more thoroughly organized and offensive form on my latest visit in 1919 and 1920.

I found immense progress in the development of agricultural colonies. There was still difficulty in persuading the Jew, except only the African or Arabian Jew, to do the actual work of the colony, but colonies were prospering, and fruit-culture, vine-culture and especially the manufacture of wine and liquors on a grand and most scientific scale, had progressed wonderfully. In general, the land occupied by those colonies was not in a proper sense ancient Jewish land. They were on the Sharon and Esdraelon plains and in the extreme upper end of the Jordan valley; but those regions were being enriched, and the country at large benefited by the colonists. The great bulk of the Jews were still gathered in Jerusalem as heretofore, and there were on one hand the intellectuals and on the other the parasitic or pauperized Jew,—what would ordinarily be regarded as the very best and the very worst. Life in the colonies was often very sweet and very lovely, a wholesome, normal family life, and an exhibition in peace and prosperity of what religious Judaism at its best may be. In Jerusalem one found the extremes of intensely narrow and bitter orthodoxy, and unbelief with extreme bolshevik radicalism. Here, too, aggressive Zionism manifested itself in an attitude of bumptiousness and aggressiveness. The country was for the Jew. It belonged to him and he would shortly take possession. One was made to feel that one's presence in the land was objected to. The Hebrew press contained angry diatribes against the existence of Christian schools and missions. The attitude taken by these Zionists at first alarmed, then aroused and irritated enormously, the native population, both Christian and Moslem, making the Jew an object of dread and hatred as he had never been before. I had opportunities to talk on intimate and friendly terms with

leaders in all camps, albeit I was unable, through language difficulties, to communicate with the rank and file as freely as I should like to have done. I myself felt the annoyance and in some places the danger of the animosity aroused. Under government order I was not permitted to visit certain sections of the country on account of the raids or uprisings of the Arabs, partly due to animosity roused by their apprehension of the Jewish invasion, and partly due to banditry, which took advantage of that as an occasion. In other parts it was difficult to travel, because any stranger, unless he could prove the contrary, was suspected of being an agent of the Zionists, spying out the land for possession by the Jews. It was difficult to obtain lodgings or food, and there were sometimes unpleasantly hostile demonstrations on account of these suspicions. Everywhere it was believed that the Jew by unfair means was seeking to oust the true owners and to take possession of their land. In Jerusalem it was asserted that the Zionist funds, or the Jewish funds which the Zionists could influence or control, were used to subsidize Jewish artisans or merchants to underbid Christians and Moslems and thus oust them by unfair competition, and that similar means were being used to acquire lands or titles to lands. It was even believed by many that the English authorities were unduly favoring and helping the Jews in these endeavors, as is shown by a letter from a Christian in Jaffa published in the *Atlantic Monthly*:—

“We are already feeling that we have a government within a government. British officers cannot stand on the right side because they are afraid of being removed from their posts or ticked off.”

From time immemorial the Jews the world over have contributed for the help of pious Jews in Jerusalem and the other sacred cities, Hebron, Tiberias and Safed, the so-called *halukha* or dole, in return for which the Jews in those cities were to win merit for themselves and those who contributed to their support by study of the law, prayer and pious observances. St. Paul carried over the same practice into the Christian Church, causing alms to be collected in the different congregations to be

transferred to Jerusalem for the benefit and support of the Christians living there. To this day annual collections are taken in the Roman Catholic Churches throughout the world which go to the Franciscans for the same use in Jerusalem. The Greeks and Armenians have like customs. In the past there had been no prejudice with regard to these doles, but now, it was claimed, the Zionist committees were using the monies thus collected or contributed to organize and help their people in a systematized attempt to gain the upper hand in the land.

Perhaps the attitude of the extremists who possessed the dominating power in the community can best be shown by the utterances of one of their own organs, written in Hebrew. (It should be stated that the English edition of this journal was, as a rule, quite different in its contents from the Hebrew edition.) One article, entitled *Malignant Leprosy*, is a denunciation of parents who allow their children to go to any school except those under the control of Jews and conforming to the demands of the local Zionist Committee. Parents are notified that a list has been made by the Zionist Committee of all children who are attending foreign schools, even though they are not subjected to any religious teaching, and it is demanded that they shall be withdrawn from those schools and placed in schools where they shall be taught the Hebrew language, customs and traditions, and kept separate from contamination by the Gentile, with his different ways and customs. Those teaching in foreign schools, or schools not complying with the conditions laid down by this Committee, are ordered to withdraw from their positions. The "malignant leprosy" is the contamination by the outside world which results from education with the Gentiles. It is admitted in this article, in answer to protests, that the opportunities in some of the non-Jewish schools are better than in the Jewish schools,—for example, in the teaching of foreign languages, so important for conducting business or securing employment; that there is greater diligence in instructing; and better hours and better care of pupils. Nevertheless, parents are informed that they must sacrifice for the sake of their race those chances for their children, doing their best meanwhile to raise their own

schools to the higher level. Those who are failing to live up to these ideals are designated as "traitors" and by other opprobrious names, and the article ends with this threat of persecution to any who do not obey the orders of the Zionist Committee thus conveyed:—

"Let him know at least that it is forbidden him to be called by the name of Jew and there is to him no portion or inheritance with his brethren, and if after a time they will not try to reform, let them know that we will fight against them by all lawful means at our disposal. Upon a monument of shame we will put their names for a reproach and blaming forever, and unto the last generation shall their deeds be written. If they are supported, their support will cease, and if they are merchants, with a finger men will shoot at them, and if they are Rabbis, they will be moved far from their office, and with the ban shall they be persecuted, and all the people of the world shall know that there is no mercy in judgment."

This was followed about a month later by a second article, also in Hebrew, entitled *Fight and Win*, which announced that the threatened persecution would now be carried out:—

"The names of the traitorous parents and of the boys and girls who have not taken notice of the warnings ought to be published at once and without delay, in the papers and on public notices, placarded at the entrance of every street. The list of these names should be sent to the heads of every institution and to the rulers of the synagogues, to hospitals, to those who arrange and solemnize marriages, and to the directors of the American Jewish Relief Fund, etc. It should be the title of 'Black List' and 'Traitors to their People'. An order should go forth to all, and if one of these men has a son, he shall not be circumcised; in case of death the body is not to be buried among Israelites; religious marriages will not be sanctioned; Jewish doctors will not visit their sick; relief will not be given to them when they are in need, if they are on the list of the American relief fund—in short, we must hunt them down until they are annihilated. Men will cry to them: 'Out of the way, unclean, unclean!' Because these people will be considered as malicious renegades, there can be no connecting link between them and us. Again, the society of young men and girls of Jerusalem must accept it as a principle to

expel from their societies all those who visit these schools; to point the finger of scorn at them; and to make them see that they are put out of the camp. These traitor scholars, boys and girls, must understand themselves that they are sinners and transgressors, who are isolated, driven from all society, separated from the Jewish community, after they have once despised Israel and its holiness, and it will be interdicted to all sons of Israel to come near them. . . . War against the traitors among our people. War by all means legal. War without pity or mercy; that the traitors may know that they must not trifle with the sentiment of a people. Fight and win."

The Zionist Committee, of whom one was an American, followed this by a printed announcement that the time of grace had passed and that forthwith the names of those who were still refractory would be posted publicly on street-corners, and the boycott begin. Miss Landau, a devout Jewess, the head of the best and highest Jewish school for girls in the city, the Eva Rothschild School, one of those, however, whose pupils and teachers were threatened under these rulings because they would not follow the dictates of the Zionist Committee, appealed to the civil authorities. The Committee was haled into court and the threatened boycott enjoined.

With such an attitude on the part of Zionist leaders in Jerusalem it might be expected that violence would ensue. Easter is a time of great excitement and unrest in Jerusalem for Christians, Jews and Moslems alike, for with Easter coincide the Jewish Passover and the Moslem pilgrim feast of Nebi Musa, when Moslems gather from all over Palestine to hear sermons in the Haram Esh-Sherif, and then march to the so-called tomb of Moses near the Dead Sea. The religious excitement of that season which vents itself in curses of each against the others, is always likely to produce physical outbursts if the cursers come into contact with one another. The Turks wisely segregated at that time each religion in its own quarter. This, in spite of warnings and requests from the Moslem religious leaders, the English failed to do, either through ultra-confidence in the *pax anglicana*, or because of objections from Jewish representatives against such segregation as applied to them. For days before-

hand hot-heads among the Jews and Moslems were inciting to riot, and in their quarter Jewish trained bands were preparing for the conflict, a preparation of which Moslems from long wont probably had no need. On Easter morning, 1920, the fanatical Moslems of Hebron arrived at the Jaffa gate with their sacred banner, singing their songs of religious intolerance. There numerous Jews were waiting to greet them. The English Tommies with their officers were all in church. Whose insults were the worst and who struck the first blow is not clear. Battle was speedily joined. The Jews were better armed, with guns against the Moslem knives; but the Moslems were the better fighters. The city within the walls was speedily in their hands. The Jews living there were the old-time Sephardic families, dwelling close-packed in miserable slums, with no sympathy with Zionism, peaceful and quite unprepared. Moslem fury vented itself on these poor wretches. Without the walls the Jews were in the vast majority. All told, by official count there were at that time 28,000 Jews, 16,000 Christians and 14,500 Moslems in Jerusalem. What the Moslem did within the walls the Jew endeavored to do without the walls. Before my eyes an Arab camp just below the great Jewish quarter was set upon, burned and plundered, the poor inhabitants fleeing for their lives while guns popped from the Jewish quarter. Two men were killed there. When the troops reached the scene the great bulk of rioters whom they rounded up were Jews. The subsequent court proceedings also seemed to place the chief responsibility for the outbreak on them. The major sentences were equally divided between Jews and Moslems, but of the criminals who received lighter sentences the majority were Jews. For a week we lived in a state of siege, not allowed to pass in or out of the city gates, or to show ourselves on roof or balcony after sundown, and for months there were guards at every turn, assemblies were prohibited and there was continual danger of a new outbreak.

The appointment of Sir Herbert Samuel, a Jew, as Governor of the new protectorate under the Zionist Mandate, greatly increased the excitement. In Moslem towns like Nablus it was openly said in my presence that no Jew might enter the place and live. The Christians, who had taken no part in the riots,

were nevertheless to a man in sympathy with the Moslems, and one saw the curious spectacle of Cross and Crescent making common cause. It was prophesied that should Sir Herbert come as Governor he would never enter Jerusalem alive. In point of fact, he landed at Jaffa and came up to Jerusalem under strong guard, with machine-guns before and behind, and the following week made a visit to Nablus and Haifa in the same manner. That was the situation when I left Palestine. Sir Herbert had at that time just issued his declaration and his interpretation of the mandate. English officers and officials almost to a man were against the Zionist Mandate, and their utterances in many cases were extraordinarily frank. Some of the most prominent and best-trained sought transfers to other posts because of their feelings on the matter, and some resigned.

It has since that time been extremely difficult to obtain reliable information of prevailing conditions. It would seem, however, from all the information I have been able to gather, that Sir Herbert, who is, I believe, not himself a Zionist, has acted with singular tact and discretion. He has shown great fairness and indicated his intention to govern with impartiality, granting no special favors to any, nor allowing outside committees or local organizations to dictate or assume to dictate unfair policies. When I left Palestine, Jews were leaving in considerable numbers, especially those claiming American citizenship, so that the outgo was larger than the income. Since then, if I may judge by reports, Jews have been coming in, chiefly from eastern European countries, some parasitic and objectionable, others of a higher type. Some of the latter, graduates of universities, both men and women, may be seen engaged in hard manual labor, I am told, building roads and the like, not despising to do such work in order to secure their Palestinian home and fulfill their aspirations.

It is too soon to judge the future of the Zionist experiment in Palestine. If the English authorities will give fair play to all, and if the Jews will pursue the old policy of the Alliance Israélite and its schools of seeking to benefit all dwellers of the land alike, to break down, not to build up, religious, racial and social prejudices, then the Jew may perhaps overcome the

present prejudice against him, and his invasion of Palestine may prove to be a blessing both to himself and to the land. The methods of those in control of the Zionist movement in Palestine while I was there were, however, aimed in the opposite direction and tended to make the Jew an object of hatred and violence wherever the opportunity for violence offered. This has been illustrated again by the recent bloody riot in Jaffa which compelled the expedition of a British warship to that port; and the order issued holding up all immigration shows that not Jaffa only but the whole country is unsafe. The Jews in Palestine are now protected only by force of British arms. Were the British troops withdrawn, the Jews would be exterminated by the angry natives, of whom the Moslems alone outnumber them in the ratio of more than ten to one; and with such action the neighboring countries would sympathize, yielding ready assistance if any were required. Mesopotamia and Egypt are seething with disaffection against British rule, and racial-religious ferment, and Palestine is to them and to the Arabs of Arabia a holy land included in the heritage of Islam. Moslem India also feels this keenly, and the British have been obliged to withdraw Moslem Indian troops from Palestine, because they will not fight against fellow-Moslems.

In this country the Jewish problem which we have hitherto had to face is not a result of religious antipathy. Religiously, politically and economically, the Jew has the same opportunity as everyone else. The Jewish problem here has been merely a matter of social prejudice, resulting from the extremely difficult task of amalgamating with great rapidity an enormous population, alien in race, culture, custom and habit. In 1880 there were, according to Jewish statistics, 250,000 Jews in this country. The Jews now claim 3,500,000, for the most part an undistributed mass huddled together in a few of the great cities—one-third of them in New York. Coming in such great numbers in so short a time and herding together thus, intentionally or unintentionally they help one another to resist the process of Americanization. This enormously increases the incidence of social prejudice. Those who have no conscious prejudice either of religion or of race are in danger of imbibing or developing such

prejudice as a method of protection of their institutions, their traditions and their habits. The Zionist movement, with its intentional development of race consciousness and race peculiarity on the part of the Jew, is an additional obstacle against the efforts of those Jews and those Christians⁴ who are seeking to break down prejudice and to bring Jew and Christian together within a common recognition of the Golden Rule: that each should treat the other as he in like instance would wish to be treated by him. One of the greatest of English Jews, honored and respected by Jew and Christian alike for his learning, his philanthropy and his godly piety, says of this racial-political Zionism that it has broken his heart, and set the clock backward for his people a hundred years. The Christian lover of his country and his fellow-men may well express a similar feeling on his side.

JOHN PUNNETT PETERS.

The University of the South.

MEMORIES

"Ships . . . they go," said Murphy, "like a spent pay-roll . . .
They're sunk in the deep water or they're wrecked in the shoal;
Burnt or scrapped in the long run, the big ships an' small,—
An' the ships a man remembers, they're the best ships of all.

"Friends . . . they go," said Murphy, "the false an' the true,
They all go at the finish, the same as the ships do;
They go like a spree that's ended or a last year's song,
But the friends a man remembers, they're his own his life long.

"Times . . . they pass," said Murphy, "the fair and foul weather,
The good times an' the bad times, they all pass together;
Like a steerman's trick that's ended, or a blown-out squall . . .
An' the times a man remembers . . . they're the best times of all!"

C. FOX SMITH.

Chilbolton, Hants, England.

⁴I use 'Christian' here as a designation of the inheritors of the traditions, the culture and the political institutions of modern civilization.

TOMBELAINE

FOREWORD

The isle of Tombelaine is on the French coast near the Abbey of Mont St. Michel. There the English strongly established themselves in 1418, and remained masters of the fortress until 1450. During this period there was constant war between Tombelaine and Mont St. Michel;—one of the few places in northern France which never fell into the hands of any foreign king. The grand assault on that stronghold was delivered by Lord Scales on June 17th, 1434. He had been then, for some years, Governor of the Castle of Domfront, and was next in rank to King Henry's great general, Sir John Fitz-Alan Maltravers.

One of the many tragic incidents that resulted from the frequent affrays is sketched in the following stanzas. At the time described, the Abbey of the Archangel was in charge of its Vicar-General, Jean Gonault, in the absence of the Abbot, Robert Jolivet. From 1084 to 1264 five Abbots had successively added to the beauty and strength of the fortress, but Robert Jolivet, who was its titular head from 1410 to 1444, made the place impregnable by adding a great *enceinte* and five defensive towers. After these important works were completed, this Abbot left the fortress and became a partisan of the English, who allowed him to retain his dignities and titles and to receive, for his personal benefit, the revenues from such of the Abbey lands as lay within the territories held by King Henry. Jolivet deserted Mont St. Michel in 1421 and never returned there.

*What is it that confronts our joy, at whiles,
When ocean, earth and some fair sky unite
To fashion an Eden—that most shadowy sense
Of the Remote returned, like memoried smiles
Of the hushed dead? Whence comes this fine, swift light—
Too fugitive,—with sudden percipience
Discovering magic in Time's darkened aisles?*

*Tombelaine, vested in sunset, makes appeal
To things mysterious—the lone rock that knew
Our Norman-blooded chivalry, who gave
Life for stern joys of war: the clouds reveal
Treasures above it in the melting blue:
Like an empurpled lioness on the wave
This islet sleeps in sheen of crimsoned steel.*

Some urgent mission of the historic past
Moves me: I see a flag on Domfront's tower
Embroidered with a blazoning of gold;
And a young, laughing palmer, riding fast
Seawards, through sunlight and a little shower:
Clearly the scene appears, as if foretold,
And faintly sounds a ghostly trumpet-blast.

That desert of the soft, Cancalian sand,
Now looped with cords of silver, seems o'erspread
By waters, tingling with the northern gale's
Wild lashes; and I see a Prior stand
Wroth on St. Michael's ramparts, and one led
Towards him—a proud-eyed lad—who never quails
Before an uplifted and most menacing hand.

A wayworn palmer seems this tonsured youth
Who, privily, with craft has ventured there,
Hopeful of appraising many doubtful things
And measuring secrets. *"Few may hide the truth
In alien speech;"*—one shouts,—*"when eyes declare
Too clearly whence their roving diligence springs;
In the foe's house there is small chance of ruth!"*

Pinioned is he and tortured, but his tongue
That so betrayed him, shapes no further word:
Then from the light to darkness he is thrown;
His soul being at a trysting-place among
Certain unquiet folk, who have not heard
Tidings that, natheless, have long been blown
Into their hearts disconsolate and unstrung.

Then, sweeping past the ocean-temple, speeds
A vessel set with knights, that cleaves the grey
And rainbowed billows, frothing towards the fort,
Where hangs the flag men see from Domfront's meads;
While monks and chevaliers make wicked play
With bows; and ere the warriors reach their port,
One, in a deathly pallor, sinks and bleeds.

England has given the Abbey a young lord
To famish: now is yet another slain,
Who valiantly at Azincourt had hewn
A scarlet path and left the trampled sward
Burdened. "*These gallants ne'er will laugh again
In Domfront's hall;*" they cried, "*nor harp a tune,
Nor take at Henry's hand the prized reward!*"

The great Archangel on his topmost spire
Glitters a moment in a glory of sun;
The Prior's eyes are turned from Tombelaine
And cast upon St. Michael, whose sharp ire
Is manifest now; and they who have outdone
The foeman's aim exult, where yet again
The arrows leave the walls in angry choir.

A racing flood befriends the boat—men leap
Ashore at Tombelaine: they turn and curse
Oarsmen who vainly follow: they uplift
Stark wrath against those Abbots long asleep,
Who, for the wonder of the universe,
Built their battlements in water swift
With death, and over quicksands dread and deep.

Long has it scorned the foeman who blasphemes
Its wise artificers: since Harfleur first
Saw Henry's face, the cunning of the priests,
Who visioned the Merveille—which to all men seems
Like an inviolate hint of heaven, immersed
In sacred light on which the spirit feasts—
Mocks them by day and nightly dims their dreams:

But against turncoat Jolivet they raise
Loudliest their anger,—he who to their king
Himself submitted, having newly spanned
His fastness with a granite zone which stays
The royal sword:—they curse his magic ring,
His pearlèd crown, his sandals and the hand
Whereon Rome's glove is drawn on festal days.

Now Domfront's chief I vision—gallant Scales—
At meat with Beaudesert and Somerset
In Tombelaine, their fortress of the sea;
While on its walls a servitor bewails
The vanished power of an old amulet;
And, in the chapel, one lies lonesomely
Whose tongue will shape no more enravishing tales.

Sadly they eat, those lords, then sadlier pace
Their thrift-lined paths. The wind went with the tide,
But from the portals of the north and west,
Quicksilver flows again; the Saint's gold face
Is mirrored: soon the dusk is starry-eyed
After the vesper truce, and peace is prest
To the sweet bosom of earth in every place.

Black are the Abbey ramparts where men doze;
While at themselves the savage mastiffs bark
Unheeded: winds and waves are enemies
Most dreaded there, where all high-spirited foes
Impotently break their strength in shine or dark:—
For Michael's rule is dominant o'er the seas
That hold his church as gardens hold the rose.

The silver chimes of Taurus merrily ring
Silent above them: from the ebon shade
Of distant Tombelaine, a boat essays
The current and is soon adventuring
Through velvet water: oars are lightly laid
On the reflected stars, whose silver rays
Light those who fear no bowman's humming string.

All but enisled the monstrous Abbey looms
Gold-windowed in the dark, while Scales withdraws
Unto belovèd Domfront, with his soul
Yearning towards the donjon's mouldy glooms,
Where one, midst dripping horror, fills the pause
'Twixt life and death with thoughts that half console
A proven knight whom chance of war entombs.

As Henry's liegemen cleave the swirling tide,
They see blue, ghostly light round Michael's towers:
Like candle-curious moths the saints appear
About their loved Archangel, who with pride
Points to the stars. In such significant hours
Of strife, folks say the saints by night draw near
Those flames that shew with whom heaven is allied.

*In the archivum of the mind, old names
Dimly-remembered, thus renew themselves
In vision: pale records of a tragic day
Awake: in the young wind, like unseen flames
They palpitate; and as a scholar delves
And finds bright treasure in some classic clay,
These, from Death's quiet, memory reclaims.*

*Dead men I see whilst purple Tombelaine
Cries to my heart: I burn with pride of them,
Knowing not wherefore. Could the walls speak truth
Should I be told? Who shall revive again
For me the long-spent voices? Like a gem
The island lies in summer, and new youth
Ever sweeps over it in sun and rain.*

ROWLAND THIRLMERE.

London, England.

THIERS AND THE JULY DAYS

During the past year in France there has been a great revival of interest in the heroes of 1870. The ceremonies in commemoration of the founding of the Third Republic have recalled from a rapidly fading past the names of men who are not deserving of oblivion and whom France, gratefully mindful of her debt, will make immortal. The name of Gambetta has been on the lips of everyone, and the great apotheosis of him that has recently taken place was a well-merited tribute. But Gambetta has not been alone in receiving honors. Here and there among the discourses that have been pronounced we may find a reference to Thiers,—Adolphe Thiers,—whose services to France in 1870 were almost as great as those of any other man. True, his life was not so spectacular, but it was none the less filled with experiences; for Thiers beheld and participated in three revolutions, those of 1830, of 1848 and of 1870. Perhaps it will not be *mal à propos*, therefore, to call to mind at this time the first important services of Thiers to his country. He came to the fore in 1829 and his first real participation in national affairs occurred on the 28th and 29th of July, the latter being the most decisive day of the July Revolution.

Thiers was a meridional. This may account for many things in his life, but, above all, it accounts in large measure for his rapid and successful rise in the early twenties. Like all his compatriots, he was possessed of remarkable agility of mind and vivacity of spirit. He has been described by one who knew him as follows:—

“His eyes were singularly bright and seemed to illumine the large glasses that covered them. His mouth was thin and sensitive and was nearly always twisted into a dry little smile. His voice, which he did not always control well, was thin and sharp; he had the tone and cadence of the Marseillais and nothing had altered its purity and clarity. . . . If you approached him, if you listened to him talking politics with Manuel, finances with Baron Louis, tactics with General Foy, administration or political economy with this one, art or history with that; with another mathematics or astronomy,

you would at first be surprised at such facility in so young a man, but soon you would be won over and captivated by his *esprit*." ¹

And this vivacity, this *esprit*, to use the words of his countryman, carried him rapidly from obscurity in the provinces to prominence at the capital.

Adolphe Thiers was a child of the Revolution; he inherited its emotions and also some of its misfortunes. He was born into a world that demanded a struggle for survival. He was born of parents who had been wealthy but who, by the date of his birth, April 18, 1797, were in rather straitened circumstances. For Marseilles, as all other towns, had suffered and was still suffering from the economic effects of the Paris revolutions. His mother was Marie-Madeline Amic, the daughter of a once wealthy corn-merchant. His father, with whom he never enjoyed agreeable relations, was one Pierre Louis Thiers, a merchant who had squandered his wealth and who was not destined to maintain the good name won for the family by his esteemed sire, once among the most able of city administrators. The boy Adolphe was born out of wedlock, but this irregularity was corrected when the wife of Pierre Thiers died and when on May 13, 1797, he was united in marriage to the mother of his son. This duty accomplished, the father left Marseilles and does not seem to have laid eyes on his son again until he reappeared in 1832, when Adolphe had already made a name for himself. Moreover, none of his paternal relatives seems to have taken much interest in the boy, and it was his maternal grandmother and uncle who saw to his education with a care and interest for which Thiers the man was most grateful. Until the fall of Napoleon, Adolphe Thiers seems to have been destined for the Army, a calling for which he does not appear to have had any great enthusiasm,² but with the disappearance of the Emperor the military career was closed to him and the boy determined upon the law as a life-profession. In November, 1814, he left the Lycée at Marseilles, where he had made an excellent

¹ Thureau-Dangin: *Histoire du Parti Libérale*, pp. 202-3.

² Senior: *Conversations with M. Thiers*, Vol. I, p. 137.

impression, and went to Aix to be enrolled in the Law School. At Aix Thiers contracted the friendship with Mignet that was to last until the latter's death. In November, 1821, Thiers left Aix with the title of *Licencie en droit et avocat*, and joined Mignet at Paris. The two had come to the capital to make their fortune; and while they may have been almost penniless, they were not without acquaintances. At Aix Thiers had made firm friends and these had recommended the two young men to the kindness of Manuel, their compatriot and a leader of the opposition. The acquaintance with Manuel soon ripened into friendship and stood them in good stead. He found both work and friends for them. It was Manuel who introduced Thiers to Laffitte, the banker and future statesman, and to Etienne also, another prominent liberal. Through these two, Thiers and Mignet received much assistance. Laffitte probably gave Thiers his start, although he does not seem to have placed the young meridional under such financial obligations as Thiers's enemies later asserted.³ The most important outcome of the acquaintance with Laffitte was the introduction of the two young men to the journalistic world. Through the influence of Laffitte, Manuel and Etienne, all of whom possessed an interest in the paper, Mignet and Thiers were accepted first as contributors and later as staff-members on the *Constitutionnel*, which at this time was the paper most hostile to the Restoration. It represented the traditional opposition, but, being traditional, it stood in need of new energies and of new blood. This want was satisfied by the agile spirit of Thiers, who gave new and more lively forms to the old theories of the traditionalists. The writing of articles for the *Constitutionnel* and for other papers of the same sort, formed the principal occupation of Thiers until 1822. In that year occurred a crisis that gave the young journalist his first opportunity. The revolt in Spain necessitated action on the part of France, and the action that the French government took aroused the fear of many liberals, among whom we note Manuel, LaFayette and others of Thiers's acquaintance. To Thiers's mind, however, the Spanish expedition seemed good both for the nation and for the throne, and he

³Béranger: *Ma Biographie*, p. 81.

therefore supported it. It was suggested finally that he should make a journey of observation along the Pyrenees and report what he saw in the form of articles. These essays attracted much attention. Their greatest importance, however, lies in the fact that they were the means of bringing their author into contact with Talleyrand the arch-diplomat, now living a supposedly inactive life away from Paris, at his Château Rochecotte. While Talleyrand did not agree with Thiers touching the Spanish question, his curiosity had been aroused by the essays and he asked Laffitte to arrange a meeting. This occurred at the house of the banker and there Thiers first made the acquaintance of the man who was to follow his career with such a keen and almost, at times, personal interest.⁴ Thiers soon became a frequent weekend guest at Château Rochecotte.

From the year 1822 Thiers's position in Paris was established and he lived the life of a young man of promise in the world of politics and society. He continued to follow closely the trend of government affairs and remained true in his adherence to the principles of the liberal opposition. Almost before he knew it, he who was later to declare: "I have no sympathy with the bourgeoisie or with any system under which they are to rule", became a brilliant member of the bourgeois coterie in Paris.⁵ At that time society in Paris was, as now, divided according to politics. The Faubourg St. Germain was the quarter of the Émigrés and the Ultras. The neighborhood of the arsenal was the refuge of poets and historians, where Nodier, Hugo and Alfred de Vigny reigned supreme; while the Chaussée d'Antin was the rendez-vous of the Laffittes, the Rothschilds and the Periers,—in other words, of the bourgeoisie. Of this latter society Thiers very soon became a part. As such he must have experienced, along with his friends and acquaintances, all the disappointments and fears that they suffered during the Martignac ministry. And then came the swift and sudden coup that both alarmed and awakened the opposition from an "*opposition sans espoir*" to an opposition militant and determined. On August 4th, 1829, the Polignac Min-

⁴ Senior: *Conversations with M. Thiers*, Vol. I, p. 62.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 39.

istry was constituted. To the minds of the liberals this meant but one thing—revolution. It now seemed a possibility where before they had believed themselves condemned to a dumb and discouraged patience. This abrupt defiance of popular opinion on the part of the monarchy necessitated a change of tactics on the side of the opposition. At last the time had come to strike, but the old weapons of the opposition were no longer satisfactory to the *Jeunesse Libérale* of Paris. New weapons must be found and new conspiracies formed. It was open conspiracy that they adopted, and the instrument for open conspiracy became Adolphe Thiers and a new paper, the *National*.

The *National* made its first appearance in January, 1830. Its editors were Armand Carrel, Mignet and Thiers, with whom was associated one Sautetet, a publisher; its avowed purpose was the creation of public opinion in favor of a change in dynasty should Charles X persist in his foolish policy of reaction. Undoubtedly, the new paper had the interest and support of Thiers's circle of friends, but it cannot yet be stated as actual fact that any one of them, even Talleyrand, was responsible for the founding of the *National*⁶ and for the extraordinary political doctrine that it upheld.

In fact, the temerity of some of its earliest articles must have alarmed the more cautious of them. Through the columns of the *National*, Thiers advocated a government with a king, a responsible ministry and two chambers, one of which should be hereditary.⁷ As he continued, however, the ardent young journalist became bolder and finally completed his proposal with this statement: "Puis qu'il ne manque au régime Constitutionnel qu'un roi qui s'y résigne, gardons le régime et changeons le roi."⁸ This phrase was simply the first indication of a strange parallelism that he was to develop later, that of France in 1830 and England in 1688—a comparison of the house of Orleans with that of Orange!⁹ These doctrines of the *National* set the style for journalistic Paris, and soon other papers—the *Temps*,

⁶ Colmache: *Reminiscences of Prince de Talleyrand*, Vol. I, p. 56.

⁷ Senior: *Conversations with M. Thiers*, Vol. I, p. 38.

⁸ *National*, 3 Janvier, 1830.

⁹ *National*, 4 Mars, 1830.

Courier de Paris, *Tribune* and even the *Globe*, all more conservative—joined in a chorus of support, less extreme but equally determined. Naturally, trials of the press became the order of the day—but these only served to advertise and arouse sympathy for their cause.

Meanwhile the monarchy was driving fast towards its end and the subtle analogy of the Orleanists and the house of Orange seems to have gained ground. Men came to speak of the Bourbons in terms of the Stuarts.¹⁰ Finally, in the spring of 1830, there came the famous vote of the 221 on the question of the address to the King, and the Chamber was dissolved. But the new elections did not clear the political atmosphere; of the 221, 202 were returned, and of the 181 opposed only 99 were reelected. Nevertheless, Charles X remained obstinate and his ministry continued. Both, however, maintained an ominous silence that was suddenly broken in a manner foretold with surprising exactitude in the columns of the *National*. On July 21, 1830, Thiers had written as follows in the *National*:—

"Sinister rumors are abroad in Paris. In spite of the general disbelief in such a possibility, people are beginning to realize that a coup d'état will be attempted before the last of the month. The ministerial forces will cry out against the word 'coup d'état' and will protest, as is their wont, that they have not the slightest intention of making one. We mean by 'coup d'état' the following measures: not to reconvene the chambers, to break the elections and to establish a new electoral system by royal ordinance. This is what people think has been planned for the end of the month. They say as well, that the press will be the most endangered by this presumption of royal power. That would not surprise us in the least, for in the most recent movements in France the press has had an honour that she will not disown, the press has been the most guilty. But the press will resist; it will allow itself to be condemned if necessary, but it will be condemned while protesting with all its powers against such a violation of the law. The press

¹⁰ d'Herbelot to Montalembert, Feb. 20, 1830. *Lettres d'Herbelot-La Jeunesse Libérale*.

does not possess a gendarmerie to protect it, but it has courage, and that is a force that no one will ever attack with impunity."¹¹

On the 26th of July the famous July Ordinances appeared.¹² True to the prognostications of Thiers in his article of the 21st, the liberty of the press that had been sanctioned by the Charter of 1815 was suspended, the Chamber was dissolved before it had even met, property qualifications for suffrage were altered so as to exclude the higher bourgeoisie, and new elections were ordered. Backed by an article of the Charter that allowed him to make special laws for the safety of the State, Charles X and Polignac believed that the King had acted within his rights.¹³ But did this article allow the King to alter the fundamental laws of the State? That was the cry taken up by Thiers and the press. That cry became the rallying-point for the revolution that developed on the following day.

The press was the most seriously affected by the Ordinances, and as early as nine o'clock on the morning of the 26th a number of journalists besieged the law offices of Dupin [*ainé*] to find if there were any legal means of redress. Upon receiving a negative reply from Dupin, they repaired to the bureaux of the *National*, where Thiers presided at a formal meeting.¹⁴ Here it was that the first organized protest of the revolution was made. Among the measures proposed by the harassed editors was a refusal on their part to pay taxes, but this was soon dropped when Thiers left the chair and suggested a measure that was finally adopted. Thiers proposed that they address a formal protest to the King and that at the same time they lay their case before the public. This suggestion raised another problem: should the protest be made separately or by concerted action? The latter plan was supported by Thiers. "Names are necessary; we must risk our heads", he declared.¹⁵ After some discussion his proposal was accepted, a few of the more timid taking their

¹¹ *National*, 21 Juillet, 1830.

¹² *Moniteur*, 26 Juillet, 1830.

¹³ See Charter of 1814, Article 14, Anderson: *Constitutions and Documents*.

¹⁴ de Hauranne: *Histoire du gouvernement parlementaire*, Vol. X, p. 535.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, Vol. X, p. 537.

departure during the voting. A committee was then appointed to draw up a formal protest, and for this task, Thiers (as chairman), Cauchois Lemaire of the *Constitutionnel*, and Chatelain of the *Courier Français* were named. By agreement, the committee allowed the chairman to draft the document and within an hour Thiers printed the first formal protest of the July Revolution.

The document was brief, concise and to the point, written in its author's best style. After arraigning the government in the name of the Charter, for the violation of Article 14 assuring the liberty of the press, and after affirming the illegality of all royal ordinances, the protest concluded with the following paragraph:—

"To-day the government has lost the legal character by virtue of which it commands obedience. As far as our own rights are concerned, we will now resist to the utmost. As for France at large, let her decide how far she ought to carry resistance against tyranny."¹⁶

Beneath the document were the signatures of representatives of the *National*, *Globe*, *Temps*, *Figaro*, *Constitutionnel*, and *Courier Français*. The press had spoken, but Paris was silent. Charles might return from a day's hunting and learn from Polignac that Paris had not stirred. He might have one more night of freedom from anxiety.

Beginning with the morning of the 27th, however, ripples were visible upon the surface of comparatively serene Paris. The *National* and other papers appeared with the Protest published in bold type. Extra editions were soon exhausted. Workmen, furthermore, soon crowded the boulevards and streets, for when they had gone to their shops in the morning they had found placards announcing that the factories were closed indefinitely. People roamed the streets during the early part of Tuesday morning gazing at the barred shop-windows and reading extra copies of the *National* and *Temps* that were distributed gratis. The first occurrence to arouse the mob from a more than passive interest was the arrival of government officers at the headquarters

¹⁶ *National*, 27 Juillet, 1830.

of the *Temps*. Their purpose was to dismantle the presses. From the *Temps* bureau the mob followed the agents to that of the *National*, where the officers performed their duties while M. Thiers watched them.¹⁷ No sooner had they taken their departure than some machinists in the crowd set to work to assist Thiers in reconstructing the presses. When the latter were again in working order, Thiers printed a single sheet edition that was typical in its tone of impertinence and optimism. It read in part:—

“We still can talk to France to-day. Yesterday the Charter was torn into shreds; yesterday those who found in it their guarantees lost them; yesterday everyone was made free to act according to his power, and no one should expect security now save through using force.”¹⁸

In the meantime the Paris mob had concentrated at two main points, around the Palais Royal and in the vicinity of the home of Perier, where the remaining constitutionalist deputies were assembled. The military commander of Paris, appointed by Polignac, sent two small detachments to disperse the mob. At the Palais Royal an officer, losing his temper, fired upon the crowd and a riot ensued. Barricades appeared in the rue St. Honoré, and Marmont, the commander, sent to St. Cloud for reinforcements. The crowds did not interfere very much with the movement of troops but contented themselves with watching the soldiery, frequently even fraternizing with them. Towards evening the uniforms of the suppressed Garde National appeared in the streets. This was not without significance.

The 28th day of July is very properly called the Peoples' Day. The mob once turned out on the streets, the deputies who remained seem to have made a feeble attempt at conciliation and, failing in this, to have waited and allowed the people to drive the dictator and his troops from Paris before themselves taking up any constructive programme. As early as five in the morning, groups of armed men had appeared about the Porte St. Martin and the Porte St. Denis. Other parts of Paris soon pre-

¹⁷ de Hauranne: *Histoire du gouvernement parlementaire*, Vol. X, p. 544.

¹⁸ *National*, 27 Juillet, 1830.

sented the same aspect. During the night several arsenals in the lower part of the city had been raided, and arms and munitions secured. Actual fighting first set in, of course, around the Bastille and the Hôtel de Ville. By noon the tricolor floated from the towers of Notre Dame. Marmont, the military commander, now thoroughly alarmed, concentrated his forces at the Louvre in preparation for an attack. At the same time he sent a message to Charles, advising him of the situation and counseling an attempt at conciliation. From St. Cloud the monarch sent his reply; it was a curt refusal. Meanwhile, the fighting had extended to the boulevards. The deputies at the home of Puyraveau, now reinforced by Laffitte and LaFayette, sent a delegation to wait upon Marmont. This visit was unsuccessful and they returned to take up the business of a provisional government. LaFayette was dispatched at once to assume control of the republicans, who were now in possession of the Hôtel de Ville. The fighting in the streets continued all night. When the morning of the 28th dawned, the Royalist troops had evacuated their stronghold at the Louvre and were retreating in the direction of St. Cloud. The tricolor now floated above the Tuileries. Paris was in the hands of its citizens. Unless the deputies acted a republic was a possibility, even a probability.

These men had meanwhile reconvened at the house of Laffitte, where questions were discussed as to the future government of France. But agreement seemed impossible. Overtures had been received from Charles X. Should these be adopted? Should a republic be established, or possibly a constitutional monarchy under Louis Philippe? These were the questions raised by Laffitte's circle, the chief objection to the house of Orleans seemed to come from the fears of LaFayette and the Hôtel de Ville faction, whose republican sentiments were unmistakable. Finally, de Remusat was sent to interview the general. Upon his return he gave a report vaguely favorable, but enough so to make the cause of the Orleanists seem possible. Mignet and Thiers were then requested to draft a proclamation in favor of Louis Philippe. This was to be placarded about Paris during the night. The deputies then adjourned to reconvene on the morrow and take up the matter of definite overtures to the

Duke. Five minutes after their departure, Marmont and some of the Carlist peers arrived at Laffitte's door with the signed text of Charles's revocation of the Ordinances. But it was too late, and Laffitte read to them the outline of the proclamation that was already in the presses.

On the following morning—the 29th—the proclamation was posted all over Paris. The wording and proposals are cleverly arranged, and serve as excellent examples of Thiers's ability to attract the attention and sympathy of his compatriots. While as yet no direct statement has been found to warrant us in attributing the authorship of the proclamation to Thiers, yet the style and wording resemble his very closely:—

"Charles X can never return to Paris; he has shed the blood of the people.

"The Republic would expose us to dangerous divisions; it would involve us in hostilities with Europe.

"The Duke of Orleans is a prince devoted to the cause of the Revolution.

"The Duke of Orleans has never fought against us.

"The Duke of Orleans was at Jemappes.

"The Duke of Orleans is a citizen-king.

"The Duke of Orleans has carried the tricolour flag under the enemies' fire; the Duke of Orleans can alone carry it again. We will have no other flag.

"The Duke of Orleans does not commit himself. He awaits the expression of our wishes. Let us proclaim those wishes and he will accept the Charter as we have always understood it and as we have always desired it. It is from the French people that he will hold his crown."

These sentences were well calculated to attract the public eye. The catchwords—Revolution, Jemappes and Citizen-King—might cause to grow fainter the already dim recollection of the disgraceful *Égalité*, Louis Philippe's father.

Paris generally seemed to accept tacitly the sentiments placarded through the efforts of Laffitte and his lieutenants. But there were still difficulties. LaFayette—*homme aux indécisions*—as Mirabeau called him, was an uncertain quantity. Some of his republicans had torn down the placards. Then, too, there was a small but influential group of moderate deputies to be

considered. These men were influenced in their opinions, perhaps, by the cautious Perier. And finally, no definite statement had been obtained from the Duke or from any member of his house. The problem of Perier was solved when he and his moderates appeared at the home of Laffitte early on the morning of the 29th. The next business was the matter of the attitude of the house of Orleans itself. Thiers tells us that Laffitte, Mignet and he himself were the first to mention Louis Philippe as a candidate and that Laffitte seems to have had no doubt whatever as to the acceptance. Sebastiani, however, felt uncertain, and finally the deputies decided to send Thiers and one of their number to Neuilly.¹⁹

At first glance, the selection of Thiers may seem to have been an odd one. He had never been presented to the Duke of Orleans. Laffitte, however, may have urged his nomination on the ground that an invitation offered the Duke by one of the leading journalists in Paris would appear more in the light of a direct request from the Parisians themselves. Before his departure, Sebastiani gave Thiers a sheet of paper bearing the general's signature, and Laffitte handed him a note containing these words:—

"I beg M. le Duc d'Orléans to receive M. Thiers with all confidence and to hear all that he is charged by me to say to you."²⁰

Thiers then set out for Neuilly. He was accompanied by M. Scheffer [*ainé*] and an officer of the Garde Nationale. General Fajal had given the latter passes for the military outposts, but as these had not been *viséd* by the municipal authorities, the three envoys experienced some difficulty. They succeeded, however, in arriving at Neuilly before the morning was spent. Upon his arrival Thiers experienced a great disappointment. He was informed that the Duke had set out in the direction of St. Cloud, where he possessed some property about which he was anxious. Finally, he succeeded in gaining admittance to the Duchesse Marie-Amélie. This lady could not have been so ignorant and so unconcerned in Thiers's mission as she appeared,

¹⁹ Notes of Thiers dictated to M. Martin upon the former's return from Neuilly, 29 juillet, 1830, p. 1.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

for she had already seen at least one group of men from Paris. Dupin and Captain Gerard had seen her before Thiers had arrived.²¹ The Duchesse, however, informed Thiers that the Duke was not there. Thiers then told her that the moment was decisive and that no time could be lost. He broached the question. This time, the answer of Marie-Amelie convinced him that Louis Philippe was really absent. Having assured him of this fact, however, she made haste to tell him that she would gladly listen to whatever he had to say and repeat it to the Duke. She then sent for Madame Adelaide, Louis Philippe's sister. This lady entered the room accompanied by her confidante, Madame de Montjoie. Then Thiers the bourgeois made his first acquaintance with the princely blood of France. Madame Adelaide's was a far more able and active character than that of her sister the Duchesse. And it was to Madame Adelaide that Thiers addressed most of his remarks.²² To her mind the chief obstacle to her brother's acceptance of the position of Lieutenant-General was the fear that such an act would be interpreted by the diplomatic world as a *revolution de palais*. She feared the consequent anger of Europe. Thiers strove with his utmost power to persuade her to the contrary. The notes of this famous interview were dictated to his secretary, M. Martin, upon Thiers's return from Neuilly. They are almost illegible, but such phrases as these have been deciphered: "France *must* have a new dynasty. . . . we desire a representative monarchy. . . . all the world will know that you have not of yourselves sought the crown, for surely to-day it is so dangerous a possession that no one would seek it of his own accord."²³ Finally, Madame Adelaide turned to him and said: "If you think that the adherence of our family will be of advantage to the revolution—a woman is nothing in a family, one can compromise them—I am ready to go myself to Paris. I will become whatever God wishes. There I will share the destiny of the Parisians. I make but one condition—namely, that M. Laffitte or General Sebastiani come himself to fetch me."²⁴

²¹ de Hauranne: *Histoire du gouvernement parlementaire*, Vol. I, p. 594.

²² Notes of Thiers Dictated to M. Martin upon his Return from Neuilly, 29 Juillet, 1830, p. 4.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

Thiers appears to have been satisfied with this statement from one member of the ducal household. He replied to Madame Adelaide: "To-day, Madame, you have placed the crown in your house". He then asked her to write to the Duke at once, and even gave her an outline of the arguments that they should advance for his acceptance. This accomplished, Thiers took his departure and hastened back to Paris to report the result of his mission to Laffitte and Sebastiani. After some difficulty, he reached the city, arriving there a little before one o'clock. At Laffitte's house he found that the deputies had removed to the Palais-Bourbon. There he met with his two superiors. Like Thiers, they interpreted Madame Adelaide's remarks as compromising the entire family of Orleans. To make matters sure, they spread the rumor that one member of the family was expected at any moment and that soon all of them would be in Paris.

So far as Adolphe Thiers is concerned, his most important work in the July Days was completed when his journey to Neuilly was ended. In the later events, leading up to the nomination of the Duke of Orleans as King, the young journalist did not play so conspicuous a part. To himself, however, the services that he performed were of almost incalculable value. Through them he came into intimate and confidential contact with the great bourgeois who were to assist the Bourgeois King, and through them also he made his first acquaintance with the new reigning family that within six years would call him to serve in the rôle of Prime Minister.

JOHN M. S. ALLISON,

Yale University.

THE PICTURE LAND

At times, when I have been to see
Pictures in some great gallery,
I come out into streets and squares
And seem to take them unawares
And catch them practising strange feats
As picture-squares and pencilled streets.
And, peopling my new picture-land,
Saint George will meet me down the Strand,
A Teniers group, or quaint Dutch fair
Will huddle into Leicester Square.
While, as I walk along reflective,
The double gas-lamps in perspective
Seem like a purpose half-designed
And glimmering in the painter's mind.
Some people take delight to buy
 Mere mirrors of the things they know,
Or, plaintive and protesting, cry
 That they have never seen them so.
But I must from my pictures bring
 Some inner soul's eye which can doubt
If houses, streets and everything
 I know so well, are things without,
Not mirrors of some thought divine
Which painters catch and can enshrine,
And God's informing Word restate,
And His creation recreate.

GUY KENDALL

University College School,
London, England.

SOME ASPECTS OF MATTHEW ARNOLD'S POETRY

A lover of Matthew Arnold's poetry and a persistent student of his poetic methods once told me that Arnold's work possesses three characteristics which make it unique in nineteenth-century poetry. These three, the devotee declared, are fused; they are recurrent; and, although not everywhere apparent, they are his predominant characteristics as a Victorian poet. The three characteristics are: the mastery of mood-creating detail, the sacrifice of narrative to philosophical ideas, and a very special type of Hellenism. The essence of a writer's thought is sometimes discernible in his minor poems. In the poetic novitiate, before the *ars celare artem* has crept in, the poet's natural aims are evident. True, this is apprentice work, but for that very reason ideas and themes are clear, unconfused by elaboration. To understand the complex structure of the oriole's nest, we must watch him at the first of his weaving. To appreciate the perfection of Tennyson's *Lady of Shalott* we must examine some of his bad early stanzas. Arnold has written four poems which, although not weak nor especially early in point of composition, proclaim unaffectedly these three characteristics.

For mood-creating detail—moods of beauty strange and rare—there is *The Forsaken Merman*. The precise source of this story is problematical, but something may be learned about Arnold's art from merely a consideration of its possible sources. For example, did Arnold know Fouqué's *Undine*? Since no real biography of Arnold exists, we do not know. At least he was familiar with the ghostly traditions of the North Coast. He wrote of the Merman and the Neckan, and he probably knew something of cognate legends: sirens who bewitch fishing fleets; merbabies who are washed ashore and are buried by northern landmen. During the time he was composing *The Forsaken Merman* Arnold was reading French and German. He may have met—with pleasure—*Die Schöne Agniese*. Or, we should like to believe, he knew and liked George Borrow's ballad from the Danish, so like *The Forsaken Merman*. Actual proof that this particular poem was the source of *The Forsaken Merman*

there is none. The mood, indeed, is severe, while Arnold's is plaintive, and the conclusion is different. Nevertheless, *The Deceived Merman*, crude as it is, is certainly based upon the same legend. These very lines may have been studied by Arnold:—

"The Merman up to the church door came;
His eyes they shone like a yellow flame;

"His face was white, and his beard was green—
A fairer demon was never seen.

"Now, Agnes, Agnes, list to me,
Thy babes are longing so after thee.'

"I cannot come yet, here must I stay
Until the priest shall have said his say.'

"And when the priest had said his say,
She thought with her mother at home she'd stay."

Certainly, this is rather like the buried ancestor of Arnold's poem revisiting the upper air, yet no positive assertion can be made. What such prying into ancient forms of the legend does emphasize is the elaboration of Arnold's version. Arnold's use of detail is by no means Tennysonian, but, compared with this rude carving of a story, his is a cameo, delicate and sure.

The detail which Arnold dwells upon most is the wind. He is interested in the effects of the air upon Margaret and upon the Merman. The forsaken husband comes to Margaret only in moments of calm, and when the great winds shoreward blow he longs to flee back to his windless home in the deep sea. The village church is hateful, for it is perched on the *windy* hill, and as he peers into it, in search of Margaret, he shrinks from the cold, blowing airs. Margaret's punishment is the loss of husband and children, but, hardly less, she forfeits—

"The sand-strewn caverns, cool and deep,
Where the winds are all asleep."

She is to be tortured by the sound of the blowing winds and the gusty shaking of the doors!

Such a detail is not in itself unlovely, and by means of it Arnold achieves beauty, for the poem is touched with the magic of life in the sea-deeps, the life of strange sea-beasts, of un-earthly flowers, of the quiver and gleam of spent lights. The

imagination is stirred with the mystery of sea-change, of occult sights and sounds. Red-gold thrones gleam, and through the windless abysses is intoned the tintinnabulation of a far-off, ghostly bell. Definite, yet mystical, boons for the inward eye and ear.

Another use of particular detail is in Arnold's choice of words for his refrain:—

"Children dear, was it *yesterday?*"

The merman is insensible to the passage of time. The mood of a poem is the sum of its details, and such details create in *The Forsaken Merman* the mood that Arnold desires, that of strange, unhuman regret and yearning. The total effect is photographic: we *see* the white-walled town, the church on the windy hill, and the merman watching through the window. Inside sits Margaret, unrelenting, her eyes sealed on the holy book. We actually see this, and it is unforgettable.

The second and third poems, *Mycerinus* and *The Sick King in Bokhara*, reveal Arnold absorbed in a philosophical idea. The two poems are complementary, almost interdependent; they should always be studied together. In each story the central figure is a king, and each king is youthful both in years and in attitude towards life. *The Sick King in Bokhara* is Asian in theme; it is reminiscent of forgotten dynasties; and the verse vibrates with the melodies of Mervé, Orgunje, and Samarcand. But, like *Mycerinus*, it is Greek in tone, and its source is Herodotus.

Mycerinus is stunned by a decree of an oracle cutting him off with only six more years of life. He suffers less from fear of death than from spiritual confusion, for although his father was evil he had long life, while Mycerinus, though good, must die in youth. He meditates bitterly on the overthrow of his notions of justice. For Mycerinus had been orthodox; he had supposed that men's idea of justice was but a reflection of the justice of the gods. But here is compelling evidence that the gods have their own fancies about what is 'just'. Mycerinus feels that his ethics have been askew, and not least in his chagrin is the realization that his virtue, based on his self-conceived idea of

justice, has deprived him of sense pleasures. Cynically, his has been a wasted life, for, as Renan says, if there is not justice, then are the wise men fools and the fools wise men. His ideals have been—

"Vain dreams, which quench our pleasures, then depart,
When the duped soul, self-master'd, claims its meed;
When, on the strenuous just man, Heaven bestows,
Crown of his struggling life, an unjust close."

In the meantime the gulled Mycerinus, worshipping phantoms of justice, has had—

". . . no joy in dances crown'd with flowers,
Love, free to range, and regal banquetings."

Mycerinus has been naiff. The bay-trees of the wicked he has not noticed, but, as he meditates now, he sees nothing else, and the thought comes to him that even the gods themselves may be under what he feels so keenly now, the dire and mysterious Law, hateful *Ανάγκη* which, without explanation, compelleth man. Then we hear of Mycerinus in his palm-grove,—

". . . holding high feast at morn, rose-crowned,"

consuming the six years in pleasure. Yet Arnold's Epicureans are a cautious lot. Mycerinus finds the feast joyless; he meditates always upon the mystery of the Law, and, as the years pass, learns its meaning; he submits:—

"Took measure of his soul, and knew its strength,
And by that silent knowledge, day by day,
Was calm'd, ennobled, comforted, sustain'd."

Mycerinus in the face of inexplicable destiny does not live in a tub, nor console himself in debauch; he is neither Stoic nor Epicurean; he learns to live out the Law.

In essence the experience of the King in Bokhara is similar. As he rides forth, indifferent, secure, his way is barred by a prostrate man begging judgment and punishment by law. In the drought he has stolen drink from his mother, and he seeks atonement. The King is not unkind, but brushes him aside as a crank. Again he is stopped and importuned with the same plea, and again the slave is turned off as some poor devil beside himself. Yet a third time he supplicates the King. Baffled, but still kind,

the King exacts negligently the penalty of the Law, himself casting the first stone. The man dies, joyful, praising Allah.

This is revelation. The King perceives that this man is not a crank or a poor devil, but a human soul desiring to fulfil the Law. The contrast of this creature's sense of responsibility—to such law as he knew—with his own nonchalance in judgment stirs him deeply. Here is one with a higher vision of Truth than he, as King, possesses, for the slave had learned that happiness under the Law dwells only in fulfilment. Bokhara buries the slave with the honors of a king, and, like Mycerinus, he reflects.

He recalls the platitudes of his Vizier, that the King cannot bear the burden of all other men; that he has, in fact, no direct responsibility towards the slave. If this is the case, there is then written law for the slave, and no law, written or unwritten, for the King. But this is nonsense. The King is driven back upon what he knows now for truth: that for the slave there is the letter of the law, but for the King himself the spirit of the law. The latter, the higher law, is more exacting than the former, and to this he has been disloyal. The Law, although written for one, and unwritten for another, is no less stringent for king than for slave. Authority does not create the Law, but Law the authority:—

"But hear ye this, ye sons of men!
They that bear rule and are obey'd,
Unto a rule more strong than theirs
Are in their turn obedient made."

This, although elaborated upon, is the same sense of Law that Mycerinus felt. What impresses a lover of narrative as he reads these two poems is the lack of emphasis upon incident and dramatic situations. For such the philosopher-poet cares little. The oracle in *Mycerinus*, the slave's sin in *The Sick King in Bokhara* are merely grist for Arnold's purpose,—the delineation of states of mind. That Arnold cares for mood rather than action is apparent in a number of lyrics, such as *Dover Beach* and *A Summer Night*, which describe merely the *penetralia* of Arnold's own mind. Two stories, of narrative interest, are subordinated to substantially the same philosophical idea.

The Strayed Reveller, the fourth poem, illustrates Arnold's Hellenism. Arnold's love of Greek life and thought permeates all his poetry; it is absurd to think of it as centred in any single poem. Nor does any one poem illustrate the differences between Arnold and other nineteenth-century poets who turn to Greece for inspiration. Yet one special characteristic *The Strayed Reveller* has: it indicates Arnold's independence of spirit in writing of a Greek theme in a Greek manner. That is to say, in this poem he wrote of a traditional Greek theme without a suspicion of what he himself called "Hebraism": the alteration of the story to achieve a moral lesson.

For the other English poem obviously like *The Strayed Reveller* in situation is Milton's *Comus*. In both is the tale of the seductions of Circe; in both are the banquet and the magic drugs, even to the hæmony of *Comus* and the moly of *The Strayed Reveller*. But from the first note of the opening alcaics Arnold's poem is Greek,—Greek in the irregular choric metres, in the scene, and in the ideas. Instead of Miltonic strictness of conscience we rejoice in the calm and happy gods. Here, too, are the bards, who with labor and pain attain the vision of the Olympians. The eternal difference between the two poems lies in the spirit animating each, a difference especially evident in their conclusions. For Milton's concern is to teach a lesson: Heaven will stoop to feeble virtue. Arnold does not think of pointing his poem with a moral. Without apothegms on virtue *The Strayed Reveller* leaves us deep in the joy of the senses:—

"Ah, cool night-wind, tremulous stars!
Ah, glimmering water,
Fitful earth-murmur. . . .
Faster, faster,
O Circe, Goddess,
The bright procession
Of eddying forms sweeps through my soul."

These four poems, with the second and third taken together, are thus illustrations of three significant poetic characteristics of Matthew Arnold. They constitute an admirable introduction to the study of his poetry. His perfection of form Arnold

himself was accustomed to refer to frankly as "superiority of style and manner". His love of the idea, for its own sake, is the expression of his dictum that poetry is "a criticism of life". And the Hellenism found in his poetry is an important part of the concept that he held so dear in the realms of thought: "spontaneity of consciousness".

STANLEY T. WILLIAMS.

Yale University.

WOODCRAFT

"For there 's a little wood I know
Where all the trees of wonder grow."
—RONALD LEWIS CARTON.

In the woods are the faint fair flowers of the Spring—
Green fledgelings, all a-flutter and a-wing—
Their petals touched with tender pencilling.

In the woods awake the wayward winds of May,
That set the trees a-talking in their play;
And die in sleep before the close of day.

In the woods is the still pool that gleams apart,
A mirror for the haunted forest-heart,
And little rainbow lives that skim and dart.

In the woods are the faint footfalls, and the glance
Of fleet wild faces, sudden and askance,
Down the long vistas, where the shadows dance.

In the woods is the dark dell, embayed with thorn,
Into whose heaven no single star is born,
Nor, for its lone delight, one ray of morn.

Heart of the woods, perennial and alone,—
Through your green boughs all the dead winds have blown,—
The secrets they have told remain your own.

KATHLEEN KNOX.

Belfast, Ireland.

THE SOUTHERN ATTITUDE TOWARD SLAVERY

"And I also told Mark how H. C. Bunner had confessed to me that he had never fully understood the Southern attitude toward slavery as a peculiar institution not to be apologized for but rather to be venerated as virtuously righteous, until he read the record of Huck's long struggle with himself to refrain from sending Jim back into the servitude from which he was escaping."—*Brander Matthews.*

A writer on *The Ethical Aspect of Slavery* says that modern moralists, familiar with a society from which slavery has been eliminated and having before them the bad historical record of slavery, are more inclined than older moralists to emphasize arguments against it and less inclined to lay stress upon arguments in its favor.¹ The modern moralists here meant are persons respectful of the authority of their elders, but they have not escaped the influence of a changed environment. What confronted their predecessors was "a condition—not a theory", nor yet a mere record. Even Peter and Paul, recognizing a long-established and well-sanctioned system, fell back upon preaching to slaves obedience and to masters mercy.

Probably not a few people to-day in the North conscientiously seek to know the truth about Southern slavery, but a bare record will never familiarize them with it to the degree of understanding possessed by many Northern men who lived through the controversy over slavery. "The North has the principles, but the South has the Negroes." It is presumptuous to enlarge upon a saying like this. Nevertheless, it is well to bear in mind that the North did not monopolize the principles nor the South the Negroes, because the known practice in the South of principles with respect to slaves and the presence in the North of Negroes whose condition in freedom was not enviable enabled conservative Northern men to understand the real difficulties of the situation. And this understanding long kept them clear of the influence of the extremists, who, as Daniel Webster said, were "disposed to mount upon some particular duty as upon a war-horse and to

¹ Rev. James J. Fox, in the *Catholic Encyclopædia*.

drive furiously on, upon and over all other duties" standing in the way. There were other considerations than the then potent doctrine of State Rights. Slavery was virtually a part of the environment of these conservative men. Not a few had known it as existing in the North, and many lived near it, if not with it. They knew how it was carried on and how the slaves were treated; they had relations of friendship or of business with Southern slaveholders; they understood that their Southern contemporaries were not guilty of introducing slavery into the country; they saw how deeply rooted the system was and how close and extensive the relation was between Southern production and Northern and foreign industry; and they appreciated the difficulty and the peril of emancipation—especially of premature action. The abolitionist demand for immediate and unconditional emancipation without compensation appealed neither to their reason nor to their sense of justice. At an early day the abolitionists discovered that their true mission was to convert the North, and in 1831 William Lloyd Garrison declared:—

"During my recent tour for the purpose of exciting the minds of the people by a series of discourses on the subject of slavery, every place that I visited gave fresh evidence that a greater revolution was to be effected in the free States—and particularly in New England—than at the South. I found contempt more bitter, opposition more active, detraction more relentless, prejudice more stubborn, and apathy more frozen, than among the slave-owners themselves."¹

There is comfort to some minds, perhaps, but not unvarnished truth in the notion that with respect to slavery a 'good' Northern attitude was always opposed to a 'bad' Southern attitude, and that the cause of emancipation and the cause of the Union went always hand in hand. By 1844 Garrison was asking whether there could be fellowship of light with darkness, or coöperation between Christ and Belial, but the North in general was still far from conversion to his views. War and much of it was required to stir up the people to anything like this pitch. In

¹ *Library of Original Sources*, Vol. IX, pp. 95-96.

his *Thaddeus Stevens* Mr. Samuel W. McCall says that too much of the abolitionist agitation was simply disruptive in its tendency, and, as conducted by the extremists, contributed in no small measure to the causes which produced secession and war, but that the force which rescued the slave and saved the country was the sentiment of union³—a sentiment, let me add, which the leading agitators successfully repressed, if they entertained it at all. In 1862 Abraham Lincoln said to an abolitionist:—

“In working in the anti-slavery movement you naturally come into contact with a good many people who agree with you, and possibly may overestimate the number in the country who hold such views. But the position in which I am placed brings me into some knowledge of opinions in all parts of the country and of many different kinds of people; and it appears to me that the great masses of this country care comparatively little about the Negro, and are anxious only for military successes.”⁴

As Virginius Dabney puts it in his picture of Virginia life, *The Story of Don Miff*: “‘We come to save the Union—dash the niggers!’ was the angry and universal reply of the Federal soldiers when our women jeered them on their supposed mission.” As late as June, 1863, the Virginia abolitionist, Moncure D. Conway, then in London, wrote to James M. Mason, Confederate Commissioner in England, proposing, in exchange for emancipation of the slaves by the Confederate States, opposition on the part of the Northern abolitionists and anti-slavery leaders (who, according to Conway, held the balance of power) to further prosecution of the war by the United States government.⁵ Conway fell into some embarrassment by reason of this letter, partly, no doubt, because it was rather closely followed by the fall of Vicksburg and the battle of Gettysburg—events not calculated to encourage support of his proposal by his friends. The letter, however, not only represented his own wishes, but fairly reflected the original attitude of the persons with whom

³ Samuel W. McCall: *Thaddeus Stevens*, pp. 133-135.

⁴ Moncure Daniel Conway: *Autobiography*, Vol. I, p. 346.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 413.

he had been associated here, and with whose countenance and material aid he had gone to England. He himself said:—

“It has all along been their [the abolitionists'] avowed position that they are, to quote Wendell Phillips, ‘willing to accept anything, union or disunion, on the basis of emancipation’.”⁶

Garrison was outspoken for disunion if continuance of slavery were to be the alternative. Though he practised vituperation, he preached non-resistance; and in 1861 he said: “All Union-saving efforts are simply idiotic”.⁷ He was surprised when the South took precedence of himself in departing from the Union, if we may judge from his remark: “I had no idea that I should live to see death and hell secede”.⁸

The Northern attitude or attitudes ranged in fact, through various phases, from indifference to fanaticism. Fanaticism made gradual headway, and constant agitation of the slavery question did much to excite the hatred essential to a war between two peoples or between two sections. A clamor not devoid of vulgarity began to deafen ears ready enough, no doubt, to hear reason, and finally all but stifled the voices of conservatism and conciliation. Such proceedings are sometimes called “arousing the public conscience”. A good many consciences, however, were refractory. In 1846 the eminent lawyer and orator, Seargent S. Prentiss, a native of Maine, in an address to the New England Society of New Orleans, invoked curses upon “the traitorous lips, whether of Northern fanatic or Southern demagogue”, that proposed disunion.⁹ In 1850 Daniel Webster, speaking “not as a Massachusetts man, nor as a Northern man, but as an American, and a member of the United States Senate”, appealed to those whom he considered “sober-minded men at the North, conscientious men . . . men not carried away by some fanatical idea or some false impression”. When the crisis actually came there were many Northern men of excellent standing who, having no love of slavery, yet wished to subordinate questions concerning

⁶ Moncure Daniel Conway: *Autobiography*, Vol. I, p. 423.

⁷ Lindsay Swift: *William Lloyd Garrison*, p. 318. ⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 372.

⁹ George Lewis Prentiss: *Memoir of S. S. Prentiss*, Vol. II, p. 408.

it to the aim of preserving the Union. It would be foolish to disparage the ability and influence of Garrison and his associates as agitators, but it was war (a resort contrary to the professed principles of the abolitionist leader), prolonged and successful war, that finally inspired the Northern people in general with the exaltation about slavery which seems still to possess many of them.¹⁰

Much that I hear and read tends to convince me that while Northern opinion on Southern slavery is now more nearly uniform than it was during the actual controversy, it is not so close to the truth as conservative Northern opinion then was. The passage placed at the head of this article seems to me a good example of that effect of misinformation which has been called "acquired ignorance".

I cast no doubt upon the accuracy of Professor Brander Matthews's report of Mr. H. C. Bunner's 'confession', although it seems that the humor shown in Mr. Bunner's own works and vocation should have saved him from such an avowal. His full understanding seems to have amounted to the conviction that in general the Southern people (numbering millions), although guilty of something for which an apology at least was rationally due, were so perverse or so deluded as to believe that their fault, sin or crime was righteousness—even virtuous righteousness—worthy of veneration. As Huckleberry Finn was a creature of the nineteenth century, Mr. Bunner's Southerners must be assigned to that enlightened age.

Now, it is true that there were in the South people who went to every conceivable length in defending slavery, and among

¹⁰"When the war began, not one-tenth of the people of the country would have favored immediate and unconditional abolition; but in the three years' struggle [to 1864] sentiment ripened rapidly."—J. K. Hosmer: *Outcome of the Civil War*, Vol. XXI of *The American Nation: A History*, p. 125. In a note this author refers to James G. Blaine, who, in his *Twenty Years of Congress*, Vol. I, p. 504, says: "In the short space of three years, by the operation of war, under the dread of national destruction, a great change had been wrought in the opinions of the people of the Loyal States. When the war began not one-tenth of the citizens of those States were in favor of immediate and unconditional emancipation. It is very doubtful whether in September, 1862, the proclamation of the President would have been suggested by a majority of the Northern people."

them persons who insisted upon the theory of divine sanction. What is more, these persons could cite weighty precedents; and it is indeed not easy to show on Scriptural authority that slavery had not divine sanction. If the exponents of this view, however, represented *a* Southern attitude, they were neither numerous enough nor influential enough to make up *the* Southern attitude. I cannot help giving some significance to my own experience among Southern men, which has been fairly long and wide. I have never heard a defence of slavery based upon allegation of its sanctity, and I have never caught a Southerner in the act of venerating it. On the other hand, it must be admitted that no Southerner ever confided to me a wish to apologize for slavery in behalf of himself or of his neighbors. One obstacle to an apology may have been the difficulty of ascertaining to whom (on earth, at any rate) it should be made. "The 'institution'", says Mr. McCall, "had existed in New England, and had vanished for the very good reason that it did not pay." This consideration and others did not commend the abolitionists of that region to the South as father-confessors.

In the South there were virtuous men and righteous men and even some men deserving to be called, with more or less admiration, virtuously righteous. But in the matter of slavery the palm for virtuous righteousness never belonged to the South. Originally gained by Sir John Hawkins, England's pioneer in the slave trade, it finally descended to William Lloyd Garrison. When in one of his voyages his ships were becalmed and his Negroes were dying, Sir John took comfort in the pious reflection that God would not suffer His elect to perish. This exhibition made a record that stood for three centuries, but it was at last surpassed on July 4th, 1854, when Garrison held at Framingham, Massachusetts, what one of his friends modestly calls a "Judgment Day"—an indication, perhaps, that Garrison needed no election except by himself. On this solemn day, after Scripture readings, Garrison proceeded to the "symbolic action" of burning first a copy of the Fugitive Slave Law, then copies of certain legal documents unpleasant in his sight, and finally a copy of the Constitution of the United States, "the source and parent of the other atrocities—a covenant with death and an

agreement with hell"; and after the incineration he commanded all the people to say "Amen!"¹¹ According to some reports, a copy of the Declaration of Independence was included in this burnt-offering, and apparently consistency required its sacrifice in order to round out the symbolic action.

Like all other people, the Southerners were subject to the law announced by Voltaire's *Candide* at the close of his unfortunate wanderings: "Il faut cultiver notre jardin". They had to make their living with the means at hand. Such being their most pressing earthly concern, they were not given, more than other people, to dwelling upon their faults or to turning their faults into imaginary virtues. It is absurd to suppose either that they labored under a continual sense of sin because of slavery or that they felt a pious exaltation because of their maintenance of an institution of fancied sanctity.

Naturally, Southern opinion on slavery was more nearly consolidated than Northern opinion (especially after the days of slavery in the North), but it was not practically unanimous except under special conditions. It was varied by time and by circumstance. It was sometimes eulogistic and sometimes denunciatory. Economic considerations led to condemnation of slavery in one place and to the fostering of it in another. Individuals and groups held different and at times contradictory views. Some men, for instance, upheld State Rights and opposed slavery, while others upheld slavery and despised State Rights.

After all, however, the general attitude was not positive or conscious, but rather a natural acceptance of conditions that seemed natural. The abolitionist Conway had to undergo several changes of environment before he saw the enormity of slavery. Of his boyhood days in Virginia he says:—

"The word 'slave' was not used. We spoke of 'free Negroes' and 'servants'. Those were the happy days of inconsistency. Our Fourth-of-July orators talked grandly of the enormity of 'taxation without representation' and the right of every man to 'life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness'; but the bondage of millions of dusky human beings was never thought of as a thing even to be explained in those days.

¹¹ Swift: *Garrison*, pp. 306-07.

For myself, I did not know our servants were slaves, and dare say I repeated in the kitchen my favorite school declamation ending 'Give me liberty or give me death!' It [slavery] was too close to my eyes to be seen."¹²

To those who believe that slavery was venerated the following extract from a letter written to Conway by his mother in 1856 may be instructive:—

"I am the greatest slave here at any season to the servants of our household, who are raised in such a state of dependence of thought and action that they will not even make an effort to make their own clothing—indeed are too stupid to know how unless I direct them. Oh, what a thralldom to me—the white slave—mentally and bodily! I often think that if someone were to arouse me some morning from my sleep with the intelligence that everyone had left the premises, I should feel such a sense of freedom and relief from responsibility (more oppressive as I grow older) that I should be heard singing *Te Deum laudamus*—could I but banish the knowledge that they would be in a state of extreme suffering and that their numerous babies would perish. If any abolitionist could know exactly what I have endured from over-pressure of work for thirty negroes for the last month, and the worry I have had to get them to do any work for themselves, they would look on me with greater pity than on them."

In the same letter this lady speaks with scant respect of both "ultra pro-slavery men and abolitionists of the fire-and-fagot sort", and goes on to say that God's "greatest reformation have ever been commenced by the small human means without knowledge of what their efforts were to lead to, they only doing what duty personally required of them".¹³ What Mrs. Conway and thousands of other Southern women venerated and sought faithfully to discharge was the obligation to do their best for the creatures in their care. It came to be a saying that the most complete slave on a plantation was its mistress.¹⁴

¹² Conway: *Autobiography*, Vol. I, pp. 29, 30, 89.

¹³ *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 250.

¹⁴ Susan Dabney Smedes: *Memorials of a Southern Planter*, p. 191.

Not only in Virginia, but farther south, the worship of slavery seems to have been "honored in the breach". In 1827-'28 Captain Basil Hall visited part of the cotton region, and wrote as follows:—

"That slavery is an evil in itself, and eminently an evil in its consequences, no men that I have ever met with are more ready to grant than most of the American planters. That the time will come when it must cease to exist, is not, however, so general an opinion, but meanwhile it is admitted by all parties to be so completely beyond the reach of any human exertions that I consider the immediate abolition of slavery as one of the most profitless of all possible subjects of discussion."¹⁵

The experience of the young Conway was virtually the experience of every child of a decent slave-holding family. The impression of the naturalness and propriety of the conditions into which one was born and amid which one grew up was seldom entirely destroyed; but the tendency of the thoughtful who came to consider slavery more or less objectively was to find fault with it. The evil which was most manifest and which became graver as time went on was the economic strain and waste of slavery. This was, perhaps, the chief ground of Southern criticism or condemnation, but it was by no means the only ground. Moral considerations led some of the South's best men to denounce slavery and to seek means to be rid of it.¹⁶ The same sentiment existed and possibly was more widespread among thoughtful Southern women.

The intrepid 'copperhead' Vallandigham declared that meddling abolitionism taught the South to search for and defend the assumed merits of slavery. Leaving out of consideration eccentric individuals and such people as are now called 'cranks', I venture to say that extravagant pro-slavery pronouncements were almost invariably called forth by extravagant anti-slavery pronouncements. The South in general felt no need to defend

¹⁵ *Library of Original Sources*, Vol. IX, p. 55.

¹⁶ Beverley B. Munford: *Virginia's Attitude toward Slavery and Secession*, pp. 82-103; also Carl Schurz: *Life of Henry Clay*, Vol. I, p. 31, quoting remarks of Clay in 1829 on the disadvantages of slavery.

slavery until it was attacked. Possibly the defence would have been more temperate if the attack had been less violent and abusive. But the aim of the extreme abolitionists was to irritate, and their weapon was insult. How closely the temper of defence corresponded to the nature of assault may be seen in a well-known message addressed to the South Carolina Legislature in 1835 by Governor McDuffie. The character of the assault and the intent that underlay it are indeed beyond doubt. The process has been called "moral warfare waged against the South upon the institution of slavery". Of the abolitionists it has been said by a biographer of Garrison that "by provoking replies to their own exhaustless vocabulary of abuse and criticism they began to put the pro-slavery side on the defensive",¹⁷ and of Garrison himself that in this sort of warfare he was a "sure strategist", having "a power to irritate not excelled even by Wendell Phillips".¹⁸ Garrison's words were "hurled with the precision and, it must be added, with the deliberate desire to madden with which the banderillero throws his darts at the tortured bull".¹⁹ Add to this that there were "abolitionists more denunciatory and reckless of speech than their leader",²⁰ and it is not surprising to learn that the pro-slavery heart was hardened as Pharaoh's heart was hardened. Without a hint of humorous intent, it has been remarked that Garrison was lovable and gentle when not in a vituperative mood, which reminds one of the saying of some French sage about Alexander the Great: "Alexandre, quand il n'assassinait pas ses amis, avait l'âme assez généreuse". It is hard to believe that Garrison could have even an equal as a moral warrior until we find that at a meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society Miss Abby Kelley offered a resolution that "the sectarian organizations called churches are combinations of thieves, robbers, adulterers, pirates and murderers, and as such form the bulwark of American slavery".²¹

To most of the Southerners who considered it, the problem of emancipating the slaves without removing them from the

¹⁷ Swift: *Garrison*, p. 84.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 90.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 150.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 84.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 227.

country seemed most difficult, if not insoluble. It baffled some of the best minds—notably the mind of Thomas Jefferson, an owner of slaves but a vehement enemy of slavery.²³ He gave much thought to the question of emancipation, and welcomed discussion of it, saying that “every plan should be advocated and every experiment tried which may do something towards the ultimate object”;²⁴ but it is to be noted that in this matter he had not much confidence in “noisy pretenders to exclusive humanity”.²⁴ Jefferson's opinions and the opinions of James Madison and others helped a later movement toward emancipation in Virginia. At one time this movement gave promise of success, and its actual success would have led to organized efforts for emancipation in the other Southern States, for at the time Virginia's prestige was great with them, and Virginia's practical example must have had a weighty influence. Moreover, there was a nucleus of emancipationist sentiment in the other States.

In the Virginia General Assembly of 1831-'32 several schemes of emancipation were considered, one of which was submitted by Jefferson's grandson, Thomas Jefferson Randolph. In the course of the discussion slavery was bitterly denounced by men of high standing. No bill for actual emancipation was passed, but the House of Delegates, by a vote of 79 to 41, approved a measure providing for the deportation and colonization of Negroes then free or to become free, which was subsequently defeated in the Senate by only one vote. The sentiment for emancipation seems to have been stronger at that time than any opposition to it in principle, and the real stumbling-block was apparently the practical difficulty of freeing the slaves.²⁵ The measure that went through the House and barely failed in the Senate drew part of its support from the belief of emancipationists that many people would free slaves if means were provided to remove and

²³ See views of Jefferson and Clay and also of Abraham Lincoln, cited in Munford's *Virginia's Attitude toward Slavery and Secession*, pp. 75-81, 183-184.

²⁴ William Elroy Curtis: *The True Thomas Jefferson*, p. 83. ²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 86.

²⁵ As to the prevalence of the sentiment, see remarks of C. J. Faulkner cited by Munford in *Virginia's Attitude*, pp. 93-94; and as to the difficulties of emancipation, see pp. 159-184 of the same work.

to colonize them. The free and open discussion of the question in the Assembly was fairly to be regarded as an entering wedge, and the prospect for definite future action seemed favorable. Yet the movement virtually stopped here; emancipationist sentiment, or, rather, its organized expression, subsided,²⁶ and there was no longer a well-grounded hope that in the near future Virginia would set a fruitful example.

The main cause of this change seems clear. In 1884 Thomas S. Dabney, chief figure in a notable book, *Memorials of a Southern Planter*, wrote in a letter to a relative:—

"In 1832, I think it was, the South Hampton Insurrection²⁷ occurred in Virginia, and stirred the State to its centre, although only a dozen to twenty whites were murdered, according to my recollection. But the attempt was so bold that the people took a serious view of it. The *Richmond Enquirer* took ground for the gradual emancipation of the negroes. The Bruces, among the largest slaveholders in the State, took the stump on the same side, and the largest slaveholder in my county of Gloucester made a speech (which I heard) in favor of the measure. The State was rapidly drifting into it when the Northern abolitionists undertook to advise and cheer us on in the good cause. Agitation in Virginia ceased. Those who had openly espoused the cause took back their word, the *Enquirer* ceased to advocate it, and the old State relapsed into her old views and remained there till her negroes were taken from her by violence."²⁸

With respect to the cause of the change described by the writer of this letter, he is corroborated by a witness who also lived through these events. This is Daniel Webster, who used the checking of the emancipationist movement in Virginia to illustrate the harm done by the abolitionists. Webster said:—

²⁶ That the sentiment still actuated individuals is shown by the continuance of emancipation through deed or testament.—Munford: *Virginia's Attitude*, p. 114. It has been estimated that at least 100,000 slaves were freed voluntarily by Virginians alone, a number much exceeding the total freed by law in all the North.—James Curtis Ballagh: *History of Slavery in Virginia*, p. 144.

²⁷ The Southampton Insurrection, led by Nat Turner, occurred in 1831, and preceded the legislative session referred to.

²⁸ Mrs. Smedes: *Southern Planter*, p. 312.

"I do not mean to impute gross motives even to the leaders of these [abolitionist] societies, but I am not blind to the consequences of their proceedings. I cannot but see what mischiefs their interference with the South has produced. And is it not plain to every man? Let any gentleman who entertains doubts on this point recur to the debates in the Virginia House of Delegates in 1832, and he will see with what freedom a proposition made by Mr. Jefferson Randolph for the gradual abolition of slavery was discussed in that body. Everyone spoke of slavery as he thought; very ignominious and disparaging epithets were applied to it. . . . That was in 1832. As has been said by the honorable member from South Carolina, these Abolition Societies commenced their course of action in 1835. It is said, I do not know how true it may be, that they sent incendiary publications into the slave States; at any rate, they attempted to arouse, and did arouse, very strong feeling; in other words, they created great agitation in the North against Southern slavery. Well, what was the result? The bonds of the slaves were bound more firmly than before, their rivets were more strongly fastened. Public opinion, which in Virginia had begun to be exhibited against slavery and was opening out for the discussion of the question, drew back and shut itself up in its castle. I wish to know whether anybody in Virginia can now talk as openly as Mr. Randolph, Governor McDowell, and others talked in 1832 and sent their remarks to the press? We all know the fact and we all know the cause, and everything that these agitating people have done has been, not to enlarge, but to restrain, not to set free, but to bind faster, the slave population of the South."

The "honorable member from South Carolina" seems to have been in error if he really meant that abolitionist agitation did not begin until 1835. In 1831 Garrison, who had already developed his policy of insisting upon immediate and unconditional emancipation, was editing *The Liberator* in Boston, and he made the Southampton Insurrection the occasion of a special denunciation of slavery. Agitation was going on before Garrison became identified with it and before the Rev. William E. Channing said in 1828:—

"My fear in regard to our efforts against slavery is that we shall make the case worse by arousing sectional pride and

passion for its support, and that we shall only break the country into two great parties, which may shake the foundations of government."²⁹

One of Garrison's expectations, by the way, was to "shake the nation".³⁰ It is true, however, that agitation was particularly active and offensive about 1835, and then and for years thereafter embarrassed or repelled friends of emancipation in Virginia and elsewhere. The effect in Kentucky has been thus described by a distinguished Kentuckian who followed the cause of the Union and served as a Federal soldier:—

"Accompanied as was this [abolitionist] work of rescuing slaves by a violent abuse of slaveholding, it destroyed in good part the desire to be rid of the institution which had grown on the soil, and gave place to a natural though unreasonable determination to cling to the system against all foreign interference."

And the irritation thus caused was felt even by the class that did not own slaves.³¹

The Southampton Insurrection is the central event in *The Old Dominion*, written by the English novelist, G. P. R. James, who was in Virginia from 1852 to 1856 after about two years' residence in Massachusetts. This book is in part an avowed study of Southern slavery, with opportunities for observation (as the author himself hints) that few Englishmen ever had. Undoubtedly James became familiar with the life and the sentiments of the Virginia in which he lived, and could fairly well reconstruct the Virginia of 1831. For reasons best known to himself he makes "Mr. Wheatley", a New Englander long resident in Virginia, the chief spokesman of Southern views. Just before the insurrection the English hero of the tale (which is told in the first person) has a talk with Mr. Wheatley about an abolitionist harangue which they have heard at a camp-meeting.

²⁹ Letter appended to speech of March 7, 1850, in E. P. Whipple's *Great Speeches and Orations of Daniel Webster*.

³⁰ Swift: *Garrison*, p. 93.

³¹ N. S. Shaler: *Kentucky*, p. 198. As to Virginia, see Munford: *Virginia's Attitude*, pp. 51-59.

Part of this dialogue may be of interest here. The Englishman having expressed surprise that the people had listened patiently to doctrines contrary to their institutions, Mr. Wheatley says:—

“‘Oh, you are quite mistaken as to our state of feeling. Virginia is well-nigh an abolition State. There is hardly a man here who would not emancipate all his slaves, if he could do so without utter ruin to himself and grave danger to the State. . . .’

“‘I should think,’ I replied, ‘if the Negroes hear many more such sermons as that of the Rev. Mr. McGrubber, they will take the matter into their own hands and free themselves with vengeance.’

“‘There is the danger,’ answered Mr. Wheatley, more gravely than was customary with him. ‘Not that an insurrection of the slaves could ever be successful in this country. . . . But what I apprehend is that my fanatical friends of the North, not content with letting public opinion, which all tends towards emancipation, work its way quietly, will go a step too far, and either instigate the Negroes to some sudden outbreak, or else create a reaction in public sentiment by their irritating diatribes. Men may be led who will not be driven, and, let me tell you, you can’t drive a Virginian. You have seen to-night how much these people will bear quietly when it takes the form of argument, but there can be no doubt that such men as this McGrubber are even now circulating incendiary pamphlets amongst the slaves, which are read to little knots of them by anyone who can read. In other instances, the same principles are spread by pictures and horrid bad prints—a sort of hieroglyphic abolitionism; and if this is carried too far, the tendency to emancipation will be extinguished at once, and every man will arm himself to resist to the death.’ ”³²

To Garrison’s policy emancipation as proposed in Virginia was repugnant. He maintained as irreducible his demand for immediate and unconditional abolition. With apparent pride he said of the American Anti-Slavery Society that it “has never had any character except for fanaticism and never can have any, safely, until the trumpet of jubilee sounds throughout the land”.³³ If due credit for consistency and steady purpose is

³² G. P. R. James: *The Old Dominion*, pp. 124-126.

³³ *Library of Original Sources*, Vol. IX, p. 101.

granted to him and to his associates, it yet appears that they not only helped to create the atmosphere of war, but contributed to the baffling of Southern efforts to do away with slavery. "The children of intermeddling are strife and murder", said the obnoxious but truthful Vallandigham.

X

In his able work, *The Great Illusion*, Mr. Norman Angell writes:—

"Great and penetrating as were many of the minds of antiquity, none of them shows much conception of any condition of society in which the economic impulse could replace physical compulsion. Had they been told that the time would come when the world would work very much harder under the impulse of an abstract thing known as economic interest, they would have regarded such a statement as that of a mere sentimental theorist. Indeed one need not go so far; if one had told an American slave-holder of sixty years ago that the time would come when the South would produce more cotton under the free pressure of economic forces than under slavery he would have made a like reply. He would probably have declared that 'a good cowhide whip beats all economic pressure', etc." ³⁴

I do not pretend to know how the great minds (or, for that matter, the laborious slaves) of antiquity would have received Mr. Norman Angell's prophet of a world to come of harder work, but in the South a seer of the kind would not necessarily have been rebuffed with a rude cowhide flourish. Provided that he was fairly well introduced and, above all, that he came not as a moral warrior from without, panoplied in self-righteousness and brandishing abolitionist pictures and tracts, he would have found many a slaveholder willing politely to argue the point or even to prophesy courteously with or against him. The Southerners were fond of argument and not a little given to prophecy. Not all their prophets were trustworthy, but here and there was a man whose prediction might have been as close to the spirit of truth as this forecast made by Mr. Norman Angell about 1910:—

³⁴ Norman Angell: *The Great Illusion*, pp. 269-270. For remarks concerning factors in the production of cotton after emancipation, see Walter L. Fleming's *Documentary History of Reconstruction*, Vol. II, pp. 311-312.

"Take the case of what is reputed (quite wrongly, incidentally) to be the most military nation in Europe—Germany. The immense majority of adult Germans—practically all who make up what is known as Germany—have never seen a battle, and in all human probability never will see one. . . . As already pointed out, the men who really give tone to the German nation, to German life and conduct—that is to say, the majority of adult Germans—have never seen a battle, and never will see one."³⁵

Although long an American citizen, Mr. Norman Angell is English by birth, and perhaps he should know that the best field for an economic missionary and prophet seeking martyrdom would have been the British West Indies, and not in the time of slavery, but after emancipation—that is, in the language of the English historian Froude, after "we practised our virtues vicariously at their expense".³⁶ That was indeed barren ground for the seed "of the free pressure of economic forces". The very word 'free' was wormwood to the planters of Jamaica bereft of laborers for their fields; and it is to be feared that the emancipated, living at ease upon earth's spontaneous fruits and vexed neither with rent nor with tailor's bills, would have laughed at the notion that they were working harder under the "abstract thing known as economic interest" than they had worked under compulsion.

The remarks quoted from *The Great Illusion* follow a gloomy consideration of Roman slavery, and it is possible that Roman slavery and Southern slavery were not so far apart in the author's mind. It is precisely of Roman slavery, however, that the great historian Lecky remarks: "Isolated acts of great cruelty undoubtedly occurred; but public opinion strongly reprehended them, and Seneca assures us that masters who ill-treated their slaves were pointed at and insulted in the streets";³⁷ and so far as this goes, Lecky might almost have been speaking of Southern slavery. In the South public opinion—powerful there as in all the rest of this country—discountenanced cruelty to slaves,

³⁵ *The Great Illusion*, pp. 217, 225.

³⁶ James Anthony Froude: *The English in the West Indies*, p. 371.

³⁷ W. E. H. Lecky: *History of European Morals*, Vol. I, p. 304.

and in aggravated cases odium rested upon families for the brutal deeds of individuals. In a letter sent from Natchez in 1831 to one of his brothers in Maine, Seargent S. Prentiss, after four years' residence in Mississippi, wrote: "To be sure, there are, occasionally, men who treat their slaves cruelly and inhumanly—but they are not countenanced by society, and their conduct is as much reprobated as it would be anywhere."³⁸ In his work on Mississippi J. F. H. Claiborne says: "The cruel master lost all social position, and public opinion operated more strongly than the special enactments which, in every State, provided for humane treatment of slaves."³⁹ The English abolitionist, Harriet Martineau, though she detested slavery and discovered much in the South that shocked her, was surprised by the kindness and patience of the whites in dealing with their slaves, and it is worthy of note that both she and the more open-minded G. P. R. James found that Northerners and foreigners were reputed to be the most exacting masters, because they imperfectly understood the Negro character or were unwilling to put up with some of its peculiarities. The wise and brilliant Virginius Dabney, who demonstrated in *The Story of Don Miff* his understanding of Negroes (and who, by the way, was understood and liked by them at sight), once said that his sympathy extended to the lazy but good-natured variety of the class called 'trifling'. His sister, Mrs. Susan Dabney Smedes, whose ability to observe what went on about her and whose skill in the difficult art of telling the truth make her *Memorials of a Southern Planter* an invaluable record of plantation life, remarks:—

"When one hires servants and they do not give some sort of satisfaction, redress is at hand. The servant is dismissed. But with slaves, at Burleigh and with all the good masters and mistresses in the South—and I have known very few who were not good—there was no redress.

"It may be thought that Southerners could punish their servants, and so have everything go on just as they pleased. But he who says this knows little of human nature. 'I can-

³⁸ *Memoir of S. S. Prentiss*, Vol. I, pp. 107-108.

³⁹ J. F. H. Claiborne: *Mississippi as a Province, Territory and State*, p. 145.

not punish people with whom I associate every day', Thomas Dabney said, and he expressed the sentiment of thousands of other slave-owners. It was true that discipline had sometimes to be used, but not often; in very many instances only once in a lifetime, and in many more, never. George Page, who in his youth, and in his middle age, was about his master's person and knew him well, said, 'Master is a heap more strict with his children than he is with his servants. He does not overlook things in his children like he does in his people'.

"Apart from the humane point of view, common-sense, joined with that great instructor, responsibility, taught slave-owners that very little can be effected by fear of punishment.

"Fear and punishment only tend to harden the rebellious heart. What then was to be done with a grown servant who was too lazy or too ill-tempered to do half work, with abundant and comfortable support insured whether the work was done or not? It is clear that unless the moral nature could be appealed to, that servant had to be endured." ⁴⁰

Mrs. Smedes adds that a bad master was "universally execrated". And Moncure D. Conway says:—

"No cruelty to negroes occurred in the houses or on the farms of any families in which we were intimate. Servants were sometimes flogged, but with no more severity and with less frequency than white children." ⁴¹

The trouble, however, with Mr. Norman Angell's remark is not merely the implication of cruelty, but also the assumption (by no means restricted to him) that a slaveholder would naturally whip away as unworthy of consideration a proposal inconsistent with the system to which he was used and with his supposedly narrow view of things. Once a slaveholder, always a slaveholder. Thus Mrs. Frances Trollope and the poet Thomas Moore undertook to exhibit Thomas Jefferson simply as an outrageously brutal master of slaves. The man who for twenty years was his steward and overseer said that Jefferson was indulgent and "could not bear to have a servant whipped, no odds how much he deserved it".⁴² But another important truth is that he was

⁴⁰ Mrs. Smedes: *Southern Planter*, pp. 190-191.

⁴¹ Conway: *Autobiography*, Vol. I, p. 28.

⁴² Curtis: *The True Thomas Jefferson*, p. 87.

an enlightened man seeking more enlightenment, glad to discuss means of getting rid of slavery—glad, moreover, and usually fit, to discuss any matter of interest to mankind, from religion to the manufacture of nails. To be sure, such men as Jefferson are rare anywhere, but he had able and well-educated slaveholding contemporaries who shared both his wish to do away with slavery and his zeal for enlightenment. Among later planters of the South the average of intelligence was not low, while education was more widespread than in Jefferson's day. These men thought and read and travelled. They were concerned in whatever could improve their property or increase production, and many of them showed signal ability in the general management of great plantations, as well as resourcefulness and shrewd inventiveness in details. They took an active and sincere interest in the affairs of government, and one of the worst results of the war was the wiping out of their wholesome political influence. The world has not often known a large class more solidly good or a large agricultural class more intelligent. To suppose that they could not or would not consider the case of free labor *versus* slave labor is to suppose that they could not or would not see what was going on before their eyes. What was there to prevent Virginia from knowing as much about Pennsylvania as Pennsylvania knew about Virginia?

The following description of the condition of slaves in his region was written at or near Natchez in 1800 by William Dunbar, one of the early cotton-planters, who was commended to Thomas Jefferson as the first character in his part of the world for "science, probity and general information":—

"With regard to the condition of slaves here there is no country where they are better treated. They are supplied with winter and summer clothing of good material, heavy blankets, and hats and shoes. This is a fine country for stock, and it is easy to ration our hands with plenty of pork and beef. They are often allowed to raise hogs for themselves, and every thrifty slave has his pig-pen and poultry-house. They have as much bread, and usually milk and vegetables, as they wish, and each family has a lot of ground and the use of a team, for melons, potatoes, etc. In the cotton-picking season all that they gather over the usual

task of seventy-five or eighty pounds a day, they are rewarded for.

"They have no night work and are provided with comfortable quarters and the unrestricted use of fuel. In lower Louisiana the life of the slave, perhaps, is not so easy. Owing to their numbers stricter discipline is maintained, but the Spanish laws require humane treatment for them, and prescribe the holidays they are entitled to."⁴³

As the century advanced the general treatment of the slaves did not become harsher or more parsimonious, although the care of them pressed more and more heavily upon the planters' resources.

As the Southern slaves of the nineteenth century were not born free and did not achieve freedom by their own exertions, it seems that freedom was thrust upon them.⁴⁴ This does not mean necessarily that they were emancipated against their will (although that is true of many of them), but it fairly raises a question whether they had any definite and compelling wish for freedom. There is no doubt that some independent spirits among them chafed under restraint and yearned for liberty, but that the slaves in general were not stimulated by an ardent wish to be free seems clear from their conduct during the war. Their fidelity to their masters throughout the four years of a struggle which at almost any time they could have ended, or at least interrupted, by a revolt, is a fact destructive of the notion that they were radically disaffected. Their faithfulness may not safely be imputed to mere stupidity, for in the emergency of the war it was the most intelligent among them who were chosen and especially trusted as agents and exemplars.⁴⁵ Nor is it

⁴³ Claiborne: *Mississippi*, pp. 144-145.

⁴⁴ It has been said that the Negro's civil rights were not won, but almost forced upon him.—William Archibald Dunning: *Reconstruction*, Vol. XXII of *The American Nation: a History*, p. 213.

⁴⁵ After his withdrawal from the U. S. Senate in January, 1861, Jefferson Davis visited his plantation to prepare for an indefinite absence. He conferred with the Negroes on the place, advising them of their duties and responsibilities, and saying to those in whose judgment and loyalty he had most confidence: "You may have to defend your mistress and her children,

plausible that the slaves were eager for freedom and yet so cowed and palsied from maltreatment that throughout the South they neglected (with insignificant exceptions) for four years the opportunity offered by the absence of most of the able-bodied whites from the plantations. It is more reasonable, after giving due weight to custom, discipline and the example set by the higher servants, to put their conduct upon the plane of loyalty and goodwill.

The question is not how others think the slaves should have felt or how others would have felt in their place, but how they themselves actually felt. One of the Grimké sisters, who, as South Carolinians, were trump cards in the abolitionist hand, is said to have remarked that, although she was brought up in the midst of slavery and had talked with hundreds of well-treated slaves, she had never found one who did not wish to be free. I do not know under what circumstances this remark was made, but the degree of its significance depends largely upon the manner in which the wish of the slaves was made known to Miss Grimké.

If large numbers of slaves spontaneously asserted to her such a wish, her experience was interesting and uncommon. The slaves who felt discontent were not given to manifesting it so openly. For this or that reason an individual might wish his freedom, and ordinarily he could discuss the matter with his master, who would then come to a decision upon what seemed to him the merits of the case. But anything like a concerted or general aspiration of the kind would have been looked upon with suspicion and disfavor by the most considerate master, unless he was already prepared to emancipate his slaves. Even a tentative declaration of independence by a body of slaves would have been analogous to a hint of mutiny at sea, and the white captains of the South had no intention to surrender control to their black crews. The slaves knew where the line was drawn, and therefore

and I feel I may trust you."—Armistead C. Gordon: *Jefferson Davis*, pp. 124-125. As to the general loyalty of the slaves, see *Memorials of a Southern Planter*, pp. 313-314; *Documentary History of Reconstruction*, Vol. I, pp. 257-258; Baillagh: *History of Slavery in Virginia*, pp. 114-115; Booker T. Washington: *Up from Slavery*, pp. 12-13.

the real lovers of liberty among them and the seriously disaffected were secretive. The circumstances of the Southampton Insurrection show how secretive they could be. A small body of Negroes, moving from house to house and from plantation to plantation, butchered fifty-five people before the whites knew enough of what was going on to organize a resistance. Only the last house which the band sought to visit was defended, and in its defence Negroes took part, knowing nothing themselves, perhaps, of Nat Turner's project. Although Turner's active followers were not many, the plot had been brewing long enough to insure some knowledge of it on the part of at least a few other Negroes; yet the whites had no warning at all. The whole affair indicates, however, that grave disaffection was not widespread. At that time the white population of Southampton county was considerably exceeded by the slave population—to say nothing of the free Negroes; but the insurrection was broken when the band was repulsed at the last house.

If, on the other hand, Miss Grimké (herself an advocate of freedom for the slaves) ascertained their wish by questioning them, the result of her inquiries is neither surprising nor especially important. Most people under restraint or in a subordinate position would like to be independent, and, if sympathetically questioned, are likely enough to say as much. But with the slaves this natural feeling was qualified by equally natural considerations. Usually, the slave who asked for freedom knew or thought he knew how he could make both ends meet through his own exertions; and usually also the slave to whom freedom was offered was chary about the gift until he learned how his future was to be assured. Mrs. Smedes tells of two dissatisfied Negroes to whom her father offered freedom with a bonus, and who rejected the offer because of the stipulation that they should never return to the plantation if they left it.⁴⁶ In an early chapter of *The Old Dominion* James presents the following evidence of his qualification to deal with old Virginia:—

“I heard a loud dispute at the foot of the stairs, and found another fellow as black as himself abusing no other person

⁴⁶ Mrs. Smedes: *Southern Planter*, pp. 102-103.

than Mr. Zedekiah Jones. . . . I did not stop to listen, but one vituperative epithet was applied to him by his opponent which I never should have expected to hear addressed by one negro to another. 'You're a damn'd black free nigger!' cried the little stumpy fellow who was contending with him. 'You're as black as I am,' retorted Zedekiah, 'and nigger too. I couldn't help being free. Old massa 'mancipate me whether I like or no.'"⁴⁷

As a rule, the free Negroes were not nearly so well off as the slaves, who, indeed, looked upon the class with contempt.⁴⁸ The free Negro, if not a man without a country, was at least a man without a family—a nobody tied to nobody. The plight of the free Negroes in the North was still worse, for they had not even the precarious 'pickings' of their Southern brethren. Seargent S. Prentiss says of the Mississippi slaves that their situation was much preferable to that of the free Negroes who infested the Northern cities.⁴⁹ In 1844 John C. Calhoun, then Secretary of State, wrote in a letter to the British Minister at Washington:—

"The census and other authentic documents show that, in all instances where the States have changed the former relations between the two races, the condition of the African, instead of being improved, has become worse. They have invariably sunk into vice and pauperism, accompanied by the bodily and mental inflictions incident thereto—deafness, blindness, insanity, and idiocy—to a degree without example", etc.

And Calhoun proceeded to support his statements by statistics.⁵⁰ A slave, therefore, could not expect much from mere freedom in either section.

In a description of the formal emancipation of the slaves on the plantation where he himself lived in slavery as a child, Booker T. Washington wrote:—

⁴⁷ *The Old Dominion*, p. 12.

⁴⁸ Booker T. Washington: *Two Generations under Freedom*, in *The Outlook*, February 7, 1903, p. 295.

⁴⁹ *Memoir of S. S. Prentiss*, Vol. I, pp. 107-108.

⁵⁰ *Library of Original Sources*, Vol. IX, pp. 114-115. See also Munford: *Virginia's Attitude*, pp. 162-163, 169-174; and James: *The Old Dominion*, pp. 11 and 127. It is to be remembered that James spent about two years in the North before going to Virginia.

"The great responsibility of being free, of having charge of themselves, of having to think and plan for themselves and their children seemed to take possession of them. . . . Was it any wonder that within a few hours the wild rejoicing ceased, and a feeling of deep gloom seemed to pervade the slave quarters? To some it seemed that, now they were in actual possession of it, freedom was a more serious thing than they expected to find it. . . . As I have stated, most of the colored people left the old plantation for a short while at least, so as to be sure, it seemed, that they could leave and try their freedom on to see how it felt. After they had remained away for a time many of the older slaves, especially, returned to their old homes and made some kind of contract by which they remained on the estate."⁵¹

The case of the Kentucky slaves in the period of abolitionist excitement is significant. In spite of the nearness of a large part of the State to free communities and to stations of the 'underground railroad', the fugitives from Kentucky were few, and even in the region along the Ohio River the slaves generally remained quietly at home. It has been said that if all the slaves in Kentucky had been allowed to wander for six months with the option of returning at the end of their leave, three-fourths of them would have come back to their homes and to their 'yoke'.

It is, nevertheless, probable that almost everywhere the slave felt a rather placid wish to be free and that this feeling, not unmingled with a natural longing for mere change of scene and circumstance, was strongest with the young. But liberty for liberty's sake was not the common goal. Assurance that the change would not be for the worse was needed by those mindful of their own welfare, who made up the great majority. Apart from other considerations,⁵² the slaves knew where their bread

⁵¹ Washington: *Up from Slavery*, pp. 21-22 and 24.

⁵² Prominent among these considerations was the general affection of the slaves for their masters and their masters' families. Concerning this see Fleming: *Documentary History of Reconstruction*, Vol. I, pp. 257-258; Balogh: *History of Slavery in Virginia*, pp. 100-101, 114-115. Booker T. Washington (*Up from Slavery*, p. 22,) says of the older slaves: "Besides, deep down in their hearts there was a strange and peculiar attachment to 'Old Marster'

was buttered, and generally they had no difficulty in choosing between the humble safety of dry land and the glorious uncertainty of the sea of freedom. To Prentiss the slaves seemed "fully as happy as their masters".⁵³ They were, indeed, happier, if happiness is to be inferred from evidences of contentment and from the disposition and the ability to make the most of a good time. Contentment may be an ignoble state, but it is not subjectively an unhappy one. If the state of most of a population numbering millions even approaches contentment, no tears need be shed over their lot except by those who would introduce among them the loftier standard of discontent.

Conway says that Thomas Carlyle remarked to him:—

"I have no dislike of the Negroes. By wise and kindly treatment they might have been made into a happy and contented laboring population. I do not wish for them any condition which I would not under like circumstances wish for myself. No man can have anything better than the protection and guidance of one wiser and better than himself, who would feed and clothe him and heal him if he were sick, and get out of him the exact kind of work that he was competent to achieve."⁵⁴

Aside from the implication that they were not wisely and kindly treated, this remark seems applicable to the condition and sentiment of the Southern slaves. That the treatment of most of them was kind is beyond reasonable doubt; whether it was wise is necessarily a matter of opinion. Yet it is true that almost all the equipment of the Southern Negroes for the adventure of freedom came from their training as slaves, including the practice of useful occupations and trades, the teaching of which began at an early day and was conscientiously carried on, for instance, by Thomas Jefferson and by his father before him. But besides and above these bread-winning arts there was

and 'Old Missus' and to their children which they found it hard to think of breaking off." For evidence of the reluctance of many to leave their masters permanently, see Dr. Fleming's admirable *Documentary History of Reconstruction*, Vol. I, pp. 84, 86; also Munford: *Virginia's Attitude*, pp. 70-74.

⁵³ *Memoir of S. S. Prentiss*, Vol. I, pp. 107-108.

⁵⁴ Conway: *Autobiography*, Vol. I, p. 400.

acquired a general discipline without which the condition of the Negroes after the war would have been even more disastrous to themselves and even more a source of danger to others. Booker T. Washington says that "the ten million Negroes inhabiting this country, who themselves or whose ancestors went through the school of American slavery, are in a stronger and more hopeful condition, materially, intellectually, morally and religiously, than is true of an equal number of black people in any other portion of the globe". Returning to this subject, Washington says of his friend Lewis Adams:—

"I have always felt that Mr. Adams, in a large degree, derived his unusual power of mind from the training given his hands in the process of mastering well three trades during the days of slavery. If one goes to-day [that is, more than thirty years after the war's end] into any Southern town and asks for the leading and most reliable colored man in the community, I believe that in five cases out of ten he will be directed to a Negro who learned a trade during the days of slavery."⁵⁵

Those who think that the South would not have dealt with the problem of slavery or was not competent to deal with it should take some account of the fact that the Negro question is to-day mainly a Southern question, to be dealt with mainly by the South. The war had as one of its immediate results the end of formal slavery⁵⁶ and as a remoter result a confusion of Southern affairs so intolerable that the burden of the Negro question, unsettled rather than settled by the ordeal of battle, was shifted back to the people upon whom it rested when all the 'sound and fury' began. While the North still kept in its own hands

⁵⁵ Washington: *Up from Slavery*, pp. 16, 121.

⁵⁶ Putting an end to slavery changed but did not forthwith abolish the Negro's "condition of servitude", which was a fact not to be destroyed by proclamations or by any sudden magic of law. Remarks made in strikingly similar terms by Carl Schurz and by Frederick Douglass, while not literally true, contain an element of truth. Schurz said: "But although the freedman is no longer considered the property of the individual master, he is considered the slave of society. . . ." And Douglass said: "He [the freedman] was free from the individual master, but the slave of society."—Fleming: *Documentary History of Reconstruction*, Vol. I, pp. 56, 89.

the remedying of wrongs, the cure called Reconstruction was compounded and applied. Of its virtues a former slave has written:—

“Though I was but little more than a youth during the period of Reconstruction, I had the feeling that mistakes were being made, and that things could not remain in the condition that they were in then very long. I felt that the Reconstruction policy, so far as it related to my race, was in a large measure on a false foundation, was artificial and forced. In many cases it seemed to me that the ignorance of my race was being used as a tool with which to help white men into office, and that there was an element in the North which wanted to punish the Southern white men by forcing the Negro into positions over the heads of the Southern whites. I felt that the Negro would be the one to suffer for this in the end.”⁵⁷

The Negroes were, in fact, among those who suffered and in nothing more than in disturbance of the good feeling of slavery days. It has been said that in the main the Southern “black codes” were conceived in good faith and designed to meet actual conditions, whereas certain Federal legislation was enacted without regard for facts so far as the freedmen’s status in fact was concerned.⁵⁸

This article is restricted, so far as has been possible, to consideration of matters concerning slavery in the nineteenth century. I have felt no need to dwell upon the right or wrong of slavery in itself. The slaveholders of the last century inherited a system planted and deeply rooted before their day. Assuming slavery to be and always to have been a sin, what may be called the original sin of American slavery is to be imputed to many men of many nations; and even those who feel a call to help in the divine function of visiting the sins of the fathers upon the children might find it hard to distinguish in such a mass the guilty fathers of the Southern slaveholders. The people of whom I have tried to speak are fairly accountable only for their own

⁵⁷ Washington: *Up from Slavery*, p. 84.

⁵⁸ Dunning: *Reconstruction*, pp. 57, 58, 63.

management of one of the most embarrassing inheritances that ever fell to man. What they might have done of their own motion about slavery is now matter for conjecture, the one certainty being that things could not long have stayed as they were. After serving purposes useful to the outside world as well as to the South, slavery had come to be an economic incubus, and in that sense at least it was too bad to last. In some other ways the old Southern life, including, in certain aspects, the relations between masters and slaves, was too good to last.

JOHN DOUGLASS VAN HORNE.

Johnstown, Pennsylvania.

CROGLIN WATER

Croglin Water, O wild Croglin Water,
Bonny from the peat and brown
As the light on the basking otter
In warm brackens lowers down!

Like your linns* that shout and blend their voices
On the rock they carve and spray,
Steals an echo heavy with all time's noises
Through the gorge of life away.

And beyond the gorge, the wider river
Shouts an answer and then is still. . . .
Praising the gift—that men may praise the giver—
O Croglin Water through the hill?

For I know no answer, though the torrent
Of my living leaps and swells. . . .
But there rise in quiet places of its current
Bubbles like an otter's bells.

JOHN HELSTON.

London, England.

* Waterfalls.

UNREALITY IN RUSSIAN LITERATURE

"Whatever is, is not. Whatever is not, is." No phrase can so well characterize the maze of reports emanating from modern Russia as this senseless antithesis. The snarled and tangled dreams of internationalism and imperialism, reactionary generals leading Chinese mercenary regiments in the armies of the proletariat, and once renowned revolutionists calling on the hated bourgeoisie for support against other followers of the same masters of thought,—all are intertwined in one lurid whole, until the mind becomes weary of the kaleidoscopic series of events and we are left to wonder if in this bedlam of 1921 we are really watching Holy Russia, the borderland of the inscrutable and changeless East.

The vivid realism which has been such a marked characteristic of Russian literature during the last century may seem to have been a poor prophet of the chaos of the present. The great authors have striven to paint life objectively; they have shown us the different types which move on the Russian stage,—the revolutionist, the noble, the superfluous man with neither will nor purpose, the peasant and the intellectual. Mysticism lay for a long time under the ban and for nearly half of the nineteenth century poetry was despised. Literature was used to preach a moral and to analyze the ills of Russia.

Nevertheless, the mystery of life, the spirit of eternal contradiction, appears even in Russian consistency. Think merely of the revolutionary influence exerted by Tolstoy, the apostle of non-resistance! His interpretation of the Gospels led him to erect a system which ran counter to every instinct of humanity and played havoc with every institution, human and divine. Uncompromising pacificism and theoretical anarchy, far from introducing the desired Golden Age, ushered in a period of war and discord the end of which can hardly be foreseen.

Dostoyevsky, the great psychologist, carried further still this study of discord. He sought the innermost recesses of the heart and brought back with him contradiction after contradiction. Space would fail to mention more than a few of these unsolved

riddles. Why, in *The Brothers Karamazov*, is it Ivan who tells the story of the Grand Inquisitor? This narrative, one of the most notable descriptions in world literature of the rejection of Christ by his self-styled disciples, is conceived not by the religious Alesha but by the atheistic and cynical Ivan. Is it any wonder, then, that later he is tortured by the return of his devil in whom he does and does not believe? Yet this is similar to his treatment of ethics, in which he shows that morality is ultimately dependent upon religion, a thesis warmly approved by the conservatives, but employed by him with a quite different motive. In *Crime and Punishment* the poor, sick, discouraged egoist Raskolnikov develops and applies the theory of the superman before Nietzsche and acts upon it sanely, as Dostoyevsky holds, but insanely in the opinion of most alienists. In *The Idiot* Myshkin is mentally deficient and abnormally keen in his judgment of human character and his appreciation of good. The analysis of these mysteries of the mind forms a large part of the motifs of Dostoyevsky.

The more modern school of Neo-Romanticism has inherited this same love for the unreal and the abnormal. It figures in many of the productions of such authors as Sologub. Thus in *Hungering and Thirsting*, the crusaders who believe in their senses and realize that they are lost amid the sands and desolation of the Syrian desert perish miserably. The poor victims of the delusion that they see around them water and food and that they are divinely led by a mystic staff come safely to Damascus, their desired goal.

A similar willingness to believe in the reality of an unreality is found in another of Sologub's stories, *You Will Remember and Will Not Forget*. Here we have not the search for a material result. A widower has loved his wife so sincerely that he sees her in his second bride. Whether she be present or not, he talks as if his first wife were with him, until the second in a moment of self-abnegation agrees that the soul of her predecessor is now dwelling in her.

This theme, used here to satisfy the conscience and quiet the soul of an old man, is not always destined to bring peace and happiness in its train. Valery Bryusov, in *For Herself or*

Another, employs much the same type of uncertainty as a particularly excruciating instrument of torture. The hero, who has cruelly abandoned his beloved many years before, suddenly meets in Switzerland a woman whom he at once takes for his former sweetheart. Stung with remorse, he confesses his fault, but Elizavyeta Vasilyevna pays no attention to him; on the contrary, she declares that she is really Ekaterina Vladimirovna and that she has never met him previously. When she finds it impossible to convince him, she suddenly changes and declares that she is Elizavyeta Vasilyevna, in order to take vengeance upon him for abandoning his former love. In proportion to the seriousness with which she attempts the new rôle his doubts increase, but he cannot come to a definite decision. When she finally leaves the hotel, his mind is no nearer a solution of the riddle and he is forced to remain in ignorance whether the torment which she inflicted upon him was for herself or another.

The same problem appears again in even more gruesome form in *The Mirror*, by the same author. The uncanny power exercised by the "I" that dwells in the mirror over the "I" that is incarnate in the personal physical body, holds the real woman spellbound and ultimately leads her to change places with her reflection. The rightful possessor of the human body now becomes endowed with the same supernatural power which her rival of the mirror had possessed. Like that, she strives to strengthen her control of her double, lures her back to the mirror, and finally by a desperate effort induces a second change and orders the mirror immediately taken from the house. But she is never afterwards sure as to which is her true self.

The volume of stories entitled *The Axis of the Earth* contains many studies in the confusion of the real and the unreal. These range from frank studies of dream criminality to *The Underground Prison*, in which a noble Italian girl, confined by the Turks in an underground prison, treats the whole episode upon her release as a bad dream.

The fondness for antiquity manifested in the last-named story is shown again in *Rhea Silvia*, a story of the last days of the Roman Empire. A young girl, thinking that she is Rhea Silvia, meets in a ruined palace a young Goth, whom she takes

to be Mars. She has a child by him, but is so strongly convinced that she is the famed ancestor of the Roman race that she hurls herself into the Tiber to complete the analogy, believing to the end that she has born the twins Romulus and Remus.

This tendency of Bryusov's to place the scenes of his stories in remote times is even better exemplified by one of his more pretentious tales,—*The Fiery Angel*, or, to quote the full title, *The Fiery Angel, or a True Story of the Devil who at Various Times Appeared to an Innocent Virgin in the Shape of a Holy Angel, Luring her to Sinful Actions; of the Ungodly Practices of Magic, Alchemy, Astrology, Cabalistic Art, and Necromancy; of the Trial of the Aforesaid Virgin under the Presidency of His Reverence, the Bishop of Trier; and also of Meetings and Conversations with the Knight and Thrice Doctor Agrippa of Nettesheim, and Doctor Faust, Written by an Eyewitness*. The novel is a careful study of the sixteenth century, presented in the form of a narrative of a contemporary author, edited with introduction and notes. The minute realism of the work, the careful scholarship involved, and the technical information regarding magic and astrology, show the great learning of the author, although they render the book slightly erudite and heavy. The plot is relatively simple, but the confusion between Graf Hendrich von Otterheim and the Angel Madiel and the frequent manifestations of the supernatural confound the boundaries of the real and the unreal. The hero of the novel, Ruprecht, a German landsknecht, wealthy from his campaigns in Spain and the Indies, is returning home to his aged parents, when he is suddenly involved with Renata, a beautiful young girl who is grievously tormented by an evil spirit. In her youth she had had as playmate the angel Madiel. Her misdeeds drove him away, and from then on she devoted herself to seeking him. She finds him in Graf von Otterheim, with whom she lives for some time, but he disappears suddenly like Madiel. In company with Ruprecht, Renata wanders about, sending her knight on errands to various people,—sorcerers, magicians, astrologers, even bidding him visit Satan's court—yet all to no avail. The Graf-angel does not materialize. When he does appear, he seems to be no angel, but a shameless knight who insults her grossly.

Renata herself appears in a dubious light, now as the friend, now as the mistress of Ruprecht, who is utterly unable to understand his fair companion. She goads him to challenge the Graf to a duel, only to forbid it when it is too late. Finally, she leaves the landsknecht and he, long since stripped of his wealth by her mad whims, finds himself constrained to take service again. He travels for a while with Doctor Faustus and Mephistopheles and witnesses their pranks as recorded by Marlowe and Goethe, including the resurrection of Helen of Troy. Soon he escapes the evil influence of this wandering pair and joins the Graf von Vellen. Here, to his surprise, he learns that a neighboring convent harbors a young girl, Sister Maria, who is in the power of the devil. He has no doubt that this is Renata, the object of his hopeless devotion. Unfortunately, as his suspicion becomes certainty, the Bishop appears on the scene and tries Sister Maria for communion with the devil. She confesses, and her story, embodying all the fantastic conceptions of the age, leads to the pronouncement of a death sentence. Determined to save her, Ruprecht arouses the sympathy of his friends and they consent to help him. With the greatest daring and with no thought of his own danger, he enters her dungeon cell, only to meet the usual treatment. Now she caresses him most affectionately and begs him to save her. The next moment she turns upon him, regards him as a foe and bids him begone. In one of her paroxysms of repulsion she dies in agony. Left alone and with his money gone, Ruprecht does not dare to return home. He hides near his father's house until he can see his parents, and then sadly returns to Spain to take part in another series of campaigns. Throughout the whole novel the natural and supernatural are inextricably confused, so that the landsknecht never knows with what power he is compelled to deal.

If in this novel the scene is laid in mediæval Germany, *Earth* carries us to the farthest limits of the future, where the believers in human progress and the advocates of the final destruction of humanity join in one last act of devastation. We are guided to a mysterious underground realm, the last refuge of despairing humanity on a dying earth. Elaborate machinery has made it possible to confine the last particles of air in many-

storied buildings far beneath the earth, where have gathered the last survivors of mankind. With inexorable slowness the hand of death reaches for them also. The rooms are slowly falling to ruin, floor after floor is abandoned, and the water supply runs more and more slowly for the diminishing population. The total annihilation of the community is expedited by the Liberators, a mystic order of assassins eager for the day when the buildings shall have been evacuated. Yet all is not happy in the doomed city. In vain does the seer Teopinski urge a noble death upon his fellows; in vain does the prefect strive to maintain by force the orders and manners of the past. Even the iron discipline of the Liberators breaks at the mention of new life and few there are that follow the indomitable servant of Death, Teotl. What is the rumor? Nevatl, more venturesome than his fellows, climbs to the top of the massive structure and for the first time in centuries a man sees the sun. He at once decides that if the human race will but rend asunder the mighty roof and come out of its caverns, all will be well. The entire population repeats the cry of Life, Life! The new idea charms the multitude and all press downward to turn the mighty levers that control the titanic machinery of the roof. The prefect, helpless in his opposition, commits suicide. Yet the chief of the Liberators is not discouraged, for he alone has learned the full secret from the seer Teopinski: that there is no air on earth. As the roof parts, he does not lament—he boasts of the approaching end. The air disappears in the void and the servants of Death and the worshippers of Life fall prostrate together as the cold and barren curse of a dead world carries to its doom the last remnants of mankind. We do not find in this drama the mingling of the supernatural and the real which so characterizes the other works which we have considered, but the gruesome confusion of life and death in the dim future illustrates another phase of the same problem. Are the quest for life and the thirst for death one and the same? Not infrequently they are, yet Bryusov presents the problem in a most striking way. The final scene, with its union of prayers and curses, of hope and despair, brings forward this question, around which the whole drama is composed.

Earth presents a contradiction, but to a civilization which is poised on an abyss of disorders and conflicts, the most significant work of Bryusov's is *The Republic of the Southern Cross*. The strange fate of Star City seems almost a prophecy of the chaos into which Russia herself has fallen and in which Bryusov is playing some part. Star City is a highly developed industrial community situated in the Antarctic, with the City Hall directly at the South Pole. Hence, on leaving the building, one must always go north, whichever way he turn. The constitution of the city is as remarkable as its site. The Republic of which it is the capital is a perfect democracy. Full citizenship is open only to miners, who number about sixty per cent. of the population. The citizens elect a council which is invested with full power, but the directors of the mines, a trust absorbed by the government on the creation of the new State, are represented on the council and are always able to impose their will on the elected members. The despotism, or, let us say, the benevolent care of the council, extends to the most minute details of life,—to clothing, the decorations of the houses, the food of the inhabitants. In a word, no portion of life is free from its protecting care. On the other hand, the workmen are better off than anywhere else in the world, their hours of labor are shorter, their pay better, and pensions and retirement privileges make them the envy of the world. Of course, there is perfect liberty of the press, but no article can be printed criticizing the government. Any discontent is at once suppressed by counter-propaganda, or, in stubborn cases, political murders are not unknown. Despite this fact, Star City remains happy and peaceful until a strange calamity falls upon it,—the *mania contradicens*. It can be seen at once that all the terms of political life, liberty, freedom, democracy, all are utterly meaningless as contrasted with autocracy, despotism, slavery. Even the sense of direction is confused under the great dome that shelters the luxurious city from the Antarctic storms. What is this new disease? It has always existed in the Republic, but never in a virulent form, and at first it is hardly noticed. Street-car conductors begin to pay their passengers instead of collecting fares. From this it is but a step to the neglect of signals by engineers

who intend to stop but fail to apply the brakes. Wrecks occur on the railroads. Nurses give poison to their patients instead of medicine. Life and property are endangered by the sudden and rapidly increasing number of cases of contradiction. In vain sane and healthy leaders protest against the new malady. In vain one remedy after another is applied. Nothing seems to be of any use. Transportation becomes worse and worse; airship lines, railroads, industry,—all are irreparably ruined. Star City is gradually isolated from the world and becomes the prey of insensate starving mobs. Horace Deville, with a handful of followers, barricades himself in the City Hall and defends it bravely. Then the wireless apparatus fails, the building is stormed, and all the garrison are massacred. When help finally arrives from the outside world, only a few wretched people remain in the once great and flourishing Star City, now through its contradictions a city of the dead.

The vividness and realism of the last days of the doomed metropolis remind us of the ghastly sacks and massacres to which we have become accustomed by five years of war. Yet this ruin of a civilization may seem a prophecy of the fate of Russia, for the peculiar union of liberty and slavery existing in the Republic of the Southern Cross sounds strangely like some of the experiments attempted in the Colossus of the North during the last few years. In reality, Bryusov was endeavoring to study the inherent contradictions which exist in a hypothetical system, and which can ruin any form of government if they are pursued with a demand for entire consistency.

In these few works, selected from the more modern Russian literature, we notice certain characteristics which are quite alien to many of the older authors. The members of the Neo-Romantic School devoted themselves to a more careful study of the abnormal than did their predecessors, and in their investigation of the unreal they failed to emphasize many of the social aims which were deemed so important a half-century or less ago. They were accordingly attacked with great bitterness for their refusal to regard their entire literary work as one branch of the movement to overthrow the government of the Tsar. They persevered in their position, however, and their works represent one

aspect of Russian character. It may not be without interest to note that Bryusov and most of his associates in this school remained in Russia during the Bolshevik régime, in one capacity or another. Most of them did not attempt to leave, and we may perhaps be pardoned for seeing behind the veil in that unhappy country some trace of the problem which they strove to answer. In the reports of strange and even fantastic doings which have been spread so widely abroad, we may feel that conditions in contemporary Russia may be treated as an embodiment of their fundamental thesis: the reality of unreality and the unreality of reality.

CLARENCE AUGUSTUS MANNING.

Columbia University.

GIFTS

I would have given you other gifts than this,—
Songs and clear days and little prayers fulfilled,—
But rest is His,
And rest is all He willed.

I would have reared you up with little joys,
Sheathed you with love as linnets from the sun,
But all my toys
Are poorer than His one.

I would have laid life's harvest in your arms,
Not these small windflowers silvering on the stem,
Their baby charms
Bidding you match with them.

I would have led you where the meadows waken,
Flung you the summer's treasure that they keep;—
But you have taken
God's early rose of sleep.

MARJORIE L. C. PICKTHALL.

Victoria, British Columbia.

BOOK REVIEWS

MODERN DRAMA IN EUROPE. By Storm Jameson. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company. 1920. Pp. 280.

ESSAYS ON MODERN DRAMATISTS. By William Lyon Phelps. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1921. Pp. 278.

ON BUILDING A THEATRE. By Irving Pichel. New York: The Theatre Arts, Inc. 1920. Pp. 78.

CHIEF CONTEMPORARY DRAMATISTS. SECOND SERIES. Selected and Edited by Thomas H. Dickinson. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1921. Pp. 734.

THE PROVINCETOWN PLAYS. Edited and Selected by George Cram Cook and Frank Shay. Cincinnati: Stewart Kidd Company. 1921. Pp. 272.

THE EMPEROR JONES; DIFF'RENT; THE STRAW. By Eugene G. O'Neill. New York: Boni & Liveright. 1921. Pp. 285.

SIX WHO PASS WHILE THE LENTILS BOIL. By Stuart Walker. Cincinnati: Stewart & Kidd Company. 1921. Pp. 54.

THE CULT OF CONTENT. By Noel Leslie. Boston: The Four Seas Company. 1921. Pp. 31.

Contemporary drama, as regards both direction and evaluation, is slowly finding itself, but the currents and cross-currents are not few and not readily chartable. A growing subjectivity is not inconsistent with an intense interest in social and moral questions (an interest, indeed, variously conditioned) and is consistent both with an idealistic realism (Ibsen, Tchekhov, Masefield) and with a symbolistic romanticism (Hauptmann, Maeterlinck).

There are, however, tributaries and perversions of the three main tendencies—the realistic drama of the north of Europe, the traditional drama of the south, and the drama of the revolt against realism—and Mrs. Jameson, in her brilliant and confident fashion, explores both the prime tendencies and the checking or accompanying movements. She finds the giants in Strindberg and Ibsen, both great realists, both northern and Scandinavian, both aware—the former consciously, the latter implicitly—of Nietzsche. Strindberg, however, although he has courage, lacks joy. His work strikes through pessimistically to

the inalienable element of conflict in life, class with class, sex with sex, its eternal war-process, but rises above the earlier realism by its will-to-power, despite the hopelessness of life. Ibsen is Strindberg's superior in both technique and soul-discovery. His work has extraordinary rhythm of character and action. As Mrs. Jameson finely puts it:—

"Each of his great dramas is an organic whole, of which the action is the body, and the spiritual movement the soul." (p. 108).

While Mrs. Jameson's exaltation of Ibsen is largely just, it is apparent that he and Strindberg are not merely the preferences of her critical faculty, but also the heroes of her personal liking, of her personal predilection for a vital realism, for an intelligible adaptation of the riper thought of Nietzsche, and of her strong personal dislike of feminism, which she loses no opportunity to berate, by no means ineffectively.

We have no quarrel with this capable writer's broad method of cataloguing and comparing the more important figures in the drama of our time, but we find a too insistent twist given to the pervading central comparison with Ibsen, whose technical influence on drama is greater than the spiritual and intellectual, precisely because his technique was to him a more certainly first-hand, less mediated, programme and achievement than were his ideas. Mrs. Jameson as often exaggerates her praise as she condemns through or by under-statement. Few critics would agree with her choice of *Rosmersholm* as the finest of Ibsen's dramas, the height of his power (pp. 75, 76). She herself is uneasy about this choice—quite contradictorily uneasy—on pages 97, 98 and 99.

Her praise of Barrie and of Oscar Wilde is sound enough, but based on the flexible standards of which she complains. She effectively 'places' Brieux and Barker, and she treats Hauptmann justly. But she fails to make out her cases against Björnson, Pinero, Maeterlinck, Yeats and Masfield. Her treatment of Synge is of only indifferent value, but her remarks on the Russian and Southern drama are sympathetic. Lord Dunsany she dismisses with the remark that he has an "American reputation".

Her analysis of Shaw is excellent, but she mars it by writing on page 140 of his half-success as a thinker, while emphasizing on page 183 his "intellectual greatness". The attribution to Wordsworth (pp. 187-189) of large influence on peasant-realism in drama is quite unsound, and the examination of symbolism (pp. 50, 51, 198-9) is rather perverse.

The style of the work is stimulating and its diction, for the most part, accurate and delicate, but there occur at times serious lapses in clarity and even in syntax. In general, although decidedly uneven in discernment, hence in value, the discussion provides a valuable addition to the critical literature of the subject. The author has three outstanding merits: she has read widely and carefully, and, despite her too positive tone and the not infrequent betrayal of a non-judicial bias of temper (she forgets Guy de Maupassant's remark that a true critic's comprehension "should so completely absorb his personality that he could appreciate and even praise the very books which, as a man, he does not like, but which he should understand as a judge"), she thinks for herself and writes sincerely. The final "Summary" is exceptionally well done.

Professor Phelps discusses, in genial, companionable fashion, six modern dramatists—Barrie, Shaw, Galsworthy, Fitch, Maeterlinck, and Rostand—for no other reason than because they interest him. "Four of them are alive, and the other two ought to be." We conjecture that he would hardly have dealt so conspicuously with Clyde Fitch save for local and personal reasons. As Professor Phelps says, "no play of universal importance has ever been written in the Western Hemisphere". Yet this essay, like the others, is informative. Perhaps the best of the group, in point of critical insight, is that on Galsworthy, while the most humanly engaging is the warm appreciation of Barrie, to the secret of whose unfailing attraction Professor Phelps comes rather nearer than does Mrs. Jameson. The paper on Maeterlinck has contact-value; that on Rostand is less worth while. The discussion of Shaw's purposes and plays is not very edifying. The writer too often tries to justify a doubtful judgment by shouting it. We wish that he would re-read

Emerson's finely sane and always apposite essay, *The Superlative*, and then count the times he has sinned against that good counsel in the present volume. Shaw is "one of the greatest playwrights in the history of the stage"; he "has an absolute [regrettable word!] genius for drama." (p. 75). "In literature he is a star of the first magnitude." (p. 77). But how can that be true when, as Professor Phelps admits, Shaw's works, "instead of having an emotional interest, have the keen play of dialectic"? (p. 97). No; without emotion no play can have a soul, and the most deft and agile of bodies or of minds will not save it for pure drama. Mrs. Jameson is right in saying of Shaw that:—

"in the creation of his men and women, he has spent much wit and little humor; much mockery and little irony; much keenness of intellect and less lasting truth; little beauty, much analysis, and hardly anything of inspiration. . . . It is not his men and women that we remember, but the ideas with which he has bedecked them; not character, but words; not personality, but the wrappings of personality." (pp. 143-4.)

Mr. Pichel's treatment of theatrical architecture and of detailed stage design is highly intelligent and useful. The author knows the history and literature of his subject, has had adequate practical experience, and interestingly conjectures some of the future needs and processes of the theatre. He writes clearly of technical requirements, and attention to his rules and suggestions will profit not merely those builders of new theatres who care for art as well as commerce, but also the designers of school auditoriums intended to serve both theatrical and non-theatrical purposes.

Despite Mr. Dickinson's assertion that in the First and Second Series of his *Chief Contemporary Dramatists*, "there are now made available in convenient form thirty-eight plays of the first order of excellence from the theatre of Europe and America", we should select only nine from the first volume and eight from the second as plays not indeed uniformly deserving of so high an estimate as his, but likely to survive the others for a long time. In both volumes, Mr. Dickinson has unfortunately in-

cluded some very poor material. The only really tolerable among the seven American plays appearing in the two volumes are *The Piper* and *The Yellow Jacket*, and neither of these is anywhere near "the first order of excellence". In Moody's *The Fire-Bringer* and *The Masque of Judgment*, not in his *The Great Divide*, we taste his true quality. It is difficult to understand why the editor permitted himself to include, on any ground, *The Witching Hour* in the first volume and *The Easiest Way* in the second. They are both psychologically crude, artistically insincere, and structurally ineffective. Nor is it possible to approve the inclusion of Somerset Maugham as a significant dramatist, nor the omission of Wedekind, Capus and others, whose works were presumably more accessible for an anthology of this character than those of Barrie and Shaw, representation of whom could not be secured. We regret to have to dissent also from Mr Dickinson's easy disparagement as old-fashioned of the critical works of Freytag and William Archer on dramatic craftsmanship. We agree that Professor George P. Baker's *Dramatic Technique* is a sound and useful book, but for serious students it is far from superseding either of the other works named. The mechanical work and editorial aids, however, in both of Mr. Dickinson's books, deserve commendation. For schools, colleges and clubs, these collections provide ready if painfully various material.

The Provincetown Players have gathered into an attractive volume ten of their one-act plays, of which the outstanding ones are Edna St. Vincent Millay's *Aria da Capo*, Eugene G. O'Neill's *Bound East for Cardiff*, and Wilbur Daniel Steele's farce, *Not Smart*. The prime weakness of most of these little plays is due to their desire to be 'different', resulting in strain and in a touch of pose and flippancy; but they are interesting as evidences of the growing fascination of the drama for young American writers and as suggesting the possibility that just as the American genius achieved excellence in the short-story during the nineteenth century, so, for largely the same reasons, it may find some flowering in the one-act play during the next twenty or thirty years.

Mr. Eugene G. O'Neill's dramatic work is steadily improving in both craftsmanship and characterization, but it still betrays something of the constrained, self-conscious spirit that hurts the efforts of his immediate rivals. He appears to be more at ease, hence more successful, with the dramatic discovery of racial qualities in individual types, as in *Bound East for Cardiff*, *In the Zone*, and *The Emperor Jones*, a remarkable study in eight scenes of the inner life and outward actions of Brutus Jones, 'Emperor' for a little while of an unidentified island in the West Indies. In *The Straw* and *Diff'rent*, a play in two acts, Mr. O'Neill attempts, not very convincingly, yet with plausible little plots and sufficiently realistic backgrounds, to interpret the characters of two women, Eileen Carmody and Emma Crosby, the one a sensitive, fine-grained, but over-sentimental 'leaner'; the other a silly, aberrant egotist, shown first as an ultra-puritan at twenty, and in the second act, thirty years later, as punished by nature for her moralistic exclusiveness. Neither Eugene O'Neill, Jeannette Marks, Percy Mackaye, Susan Glaspell, Alfred Kreymborg, Percival Wilde nor George Middleton, however, has as yet produced a one-act play comparable in conception, insight, suggestion and power to the better work in this kind of Maeterlinck, Hauptmann, Strindberg, Hervieu, Synge, Barrie and Masefield. The truth would seem to be that with the rise of the subjective or 'literary' drama, the psychological possibilities of the one-act play, its ability to satisfy Oscar Wilde's requirement that truth in art should be "the unity of a thing with itself", began to be disclosed. The Drama of Ideas and the *Théâtre Libre* have greatly advanced the one-act play in dignity and in scope.

Of the remaining plays under review we need say little. *Six Who Pass While the Lentils Boil*, one of Mr. Walker's "Port-manteau Plays", is a disappointing effort at fantasy that quarrels with its own devices, and *The Cult of Content* is a strained and confused 'guess at the riddle of existence' in pedestrian blank verse.

The signs of the continued dramatic revival that appear in the more important works here dealt with and in the multiplicity of

programmes and courses of study in colleges and clubs suggest the accumulation of social and spiritual forces throughout the world of thought, that make for a re-examination of the grounds of belief and of conduct, and for a more intelligent philosophy of human history.

G. H. C.

THE BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIANITY. Part I, The Acts of the Apostles. Edited by F. J. Foakes-Jackson, D.D., and Kirsopp Lake, D.D., Vol. I, Prolegomena I: The Jewish, Gentile and Christian Backgrounds. London: Macmillan and Company. 1920. Pp. viii, 480.

This is the first volume of three. It is historical in character, dealing with the Jewish, Gentile and Christian life, thought and religion, as a background for the later study of the book of Acts, first in its literary phenomena, and then, finally, in its actual text. In other words, the first two volumes will constitute an introduction telling about the Book of Acts, while the third volume will contain the text, with its translation and exposition. This volume is dedicated to Professor George Foot Moore, of Harvard, to whose phenomenal learning and unfailing kindness to all co-workers a well-deserved tribute is paid in the Preface. Other scholars have contributed articles on special fields, notable among which is the contribution of Professor Clifford H. Moore, also of Harvard, on *Life in the Roman Empire at the Beginning of the Christian Era*. For fairness's sake the editors secured the co-operation of a Jew, Claude G. Montefiori, in dealing with *The Spirit of Judaism*. He presents, of course, the very best side of Judaism, but strives to be fair in his treatment, and especially in dealing with the representations regarding the spirit of the leaders of Judaism in the time of Christ contained in the writings of the New Testament. So he says of the Jewish teaching of that time (p. 41 f.):—

"We find the view constantly repeated that Israel's lesser sins are carefully and fully punished in this world in order that it may receive the full beatitude of the world to come, while the minor and occasional virtues of the heathen are fully and carefully recompensed here in order that they may suffer more hereafter."

And again:—

“National and religious prejudice prevented the free development of the conception of the completely impartial God. Israel is oppressed by the heathen; and reacts humanly towards the oppressor. He cannot pay him back in deed; he can only pay him back in words and theory. God also partakes of the infirmities of His people; and, in the days to come, He will repay to the nations what His people have suffered at their hands.” (p. 46).

So, also, he recognizes the need of a new canon of Scripture which the Christian created in the New Testament:—

“When I read any early document, such as the *Mechilta*, I feel as if one advantage of Christianity over Judaism was that it made a fresh start . . . it created an extra sacred canon of its own. . . The Old Testament goes back so far in time, it is so varied, so bulky! . . . one sees the burden of it in Judaism. ‘Ye search the Scriptures.’ Well might Jesus say this! They were searched and known all too thoroughly! For the Old Testament contains not only supreme and imperishable verities but also much that was, in very sooth, already obsolete even long before A.D. 50. In other words, it was inconsistent with itself.” (p. 3 f.).

But, on the other hand, it was all of it “perfect and inspired”. Hence the quibbles of Rabbinic interpretation, hence the exaltation at times of the temporal over the eternal, and those accommodations of the Law which made moral precepts of no effect.

The book is a thesaurus of erudition and of doubts. One rises from its perusal with grave uncertainty whether anything is really known about anything. To some extent it is typical of a critical treatment common, especially, in the field of Bible study, which, putting the work or document studied on the defensive, then seems to accept the testimony of any witness which can possibly be subpoenaed against it, rather than its own evidence. It was by this method of treatment that a former generation of critics condemned Acts as a liar and an impersonator, pretending to be written by Luke when it was not, and bearing false witness to events and conditions of an earlier period.

The pendulum has now swung far in the other direction, not only for the date, credibility and authorship of Acts, but of all or almost all of the books of the New Testament. This volume however, does not seem to have swung with it. Its implications are the other way, but they are, so far as Acts is concerned, implications rather than statements, for which we must presumably await succeeding volumes. When it comes to *The Teaching of Jesus*, and *The Development of Thought on the Spirit, the Church and Baptism*, contained in Part III of this volume, *Primitive Christianity*, we have the author's complete conclusions. I will venture to say that no one could recognize Jesus from the former of these chapters, as no one could recognize a plant from the botanical description alone. The color-plate which is essential to the understanding is wanting. The resulting idea is false and misleading. I do not believe that the conception it calls up in my mind is that which the authors would wish to convey, and therefore I shall not try to criticize it.

The book is valuable to the man who needs to be stirred up to think and question. It makes one realize the limitations of our certain knowledge, and the uncertainties that beset us. In general, it is the opposite of constructive in its form and method.

I had marked for note a few small matters of inaccuracy or carelessness, but they are very insignificant and may well be omitted. I could wish that the editors had not used the German form of the Hebrew sacrosanct divine name, *Jahveh*, which is misleading and erroneous. The pronunciation is *Yahweh*, or *Yahaweh*, and one of these spellings should have been used in a book written in English for English-speaking readers.

J. P. P.

A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS. By Ernest DeWitt Burton, Professor of New Testament Interpretation in the University of Chicago. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1920. Pp. lxxxix, 541.

Slowly the great International Critical Commentary on the books of both the Old and the New Testament nears completion. The original editors have passed away, and some of the

earliest of the New Testament volumes, written before the papyrus discoveries in Egypt a quarter of a century ago, are already out of date and need to be rewritten. The dictionaries and grammars of New Testament Greek in use at that time have been superseded, as a result of those discoveries, while archaeological finds have caused an entire reconstruction of the chronology of the New Testament writings, and a revaluation of the historical trustworthiness of some of them. It has been difficult to write when each year's discoveries might cause a reconsideration of results supposedly well established linguistically, historically or religiously. In his Preface, Professor Burton tell us that this commentary represents a quarter of a century of intensive labor, and that, small as the Epistle to the Galatians is, he has felt himself obliged to confine his labors, omitting fields of research which should be cultivated. Such are the thorough and scientific study "of the rabbinic writings and method of exegesis" of which Paul makes use, to the bewilderment of the ordinary reader, and the study of the mystery religions of the Roman Empire, some of which competed with Christianity in the first centuries of our era, a study which has only recently come "into prominence". Professor Burton was already well known as the author of *Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek*. His special field has been linguistic study, and in the preparation of this volume he has devoted himself particularly to this part of the problem, making "a fresh historical study of the vocabulary of the letter".

In making this commentary he has become increasingly conscious, he writes, of "the close relationship between the experiences of the early Christian Church . . . and those through which the Christianity of our own day is passing", which has "begotten a strong desire" in him to make clear to his readers the practical value of this Epistle for "the Church to-day". He does not point or emphasize this in his comments, however, drawing a moral, or preaching, and exactly what he refers to is not clear to the critic. The two great points of the letter are the obligation of the Law, and the source and character of the apostolate, and it is St. Paul's attitude on these points, I take it, which Professor Burton finds so aptly related to present practical problems of Christianity. Paul denied "the authority of Old Testament statutes" as

such, including the Decalogue. So "in writing to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 5: 12) he refused to make the Law the basis of his reproof of sexual immorality." "All things are lawful", he taught, and he based his argument against fornication solely on the ground of the love of Christ: that to become one with a harlot "destroys the Christian's vital relationship with Christ". His attitude toward the Old Testament is discriminative: some things he accepts and some he rejects. As authority it is not binding. The only law is love (Gal. 5: 14), which brought him to Christ, and which he found perfectly revealed in Christ. Out of his own experience he learned—

"that not what was held in the past, though it stood in sacred scriptures with an affirmation of its perpetual authority, was determinative for the conviction and conduct of living men, but that the criterion for belief and action was to be found in their own interpretation of human experience, their own experience and that of past generations as far as known to them. Religion is not then, for him, static, but fluid, in constant evolution under the influence of men's understanding of the experience of the race." (p. lxi).

His view of religion was in principle that of the old prophets of Israel, and that which Jesus taught, but it was not—

"the dominant thought of those who early joined the company of his followers, and it was a novelty, indeed, in the Græco-Roman world. It has never been accepted wholeheartedly by any considerable portion of the Christian Church. It is not to-day the real creed of any great part of Christendom."

This is strong meat, but the honest Bible scholar is apt to be a bit radical, for the Bible, and especially the New Testament, is a radical and revolutionary book. In Dowie's Zionism Professor Burton had close at hand an extreme example of that *legalism* against which, as he points out, St. Paul so strongly protested, and which, in spite of the honor outwardly accorded to his writings, still largely dominates the Christian Church, represented on the one side by an infallible book, or rather an infallible interpretation of a book, and on the other by the authority of councils or popes. It is against the latter that St. Paul fights

in his claim to an independent apostleship in his letter to the Galatians, as, in his attitude towards the binding character of the Law and Commandments as external *authority*, he contends against the former.

Like most later writers Burton accepts the South Galatian theory, namely, that this letter was written to the churches in Derbe, Lystra, Iconium and Antioch. As to the date of authorship and consequently the place from which the letter was written, he is non-committal as between Corinth on Paul's first visit; Antioch between his second and third missionary journeys; Ephesus, or Macedonia or Achaia on his last journey to Corinth. Similarly, he does not commit himself on the subject of Pauline chronology in general, except that he rejects rather contemptuously (p. 69) the view recently put forward by a group of well-known scholars, based on the suggested change of one letter, or rather the omission of one number (4 for 14 in Gal. 2:1), for which, however, there is no MS. evidence, that St. Paul's conversion took place ten years later than heretofore supposed.

The commentary proper, very detailed and elaborate, covers some 360 pages. This is followed by an appendix in fine print of twenty-one notes on important terms of Paul's vocabulary, embodying much of that "fresh historical study of the vocabulary" to which the author refers in his Preface. The result is that while Galatians is one of the small books of the New Testament, this volume is the largest in the series.

J. P. P.

EUROPE, 1789-1920. By Edward Raymond Turner, Professor of European History in the University of Michigan. New York: Doubleday, Page and Company. 1920. Pp. xii, 687.

This is the latest and by far the most satisfactory book on the history of Modern Europe during the last century and a half. It is no wonder that it has been introduced into the history courses of more than a score of leading colleges and universities, and that the number is increasing every month.

It is the only book in which the whole of that history has been written or even rewritten from an after-the-war standpoint.

Other histories have included a closing chapter, or added a supplementary one on the World War, but those histories were all written before the war began, or, in some cases, before such a war seemed possible.

It adds greatly to the clearness of the road and to the understanding of the nature of the way, and of the significance of its windings, if one knows whither it leads. This is what makes Dr. Turner's work of the first importance to the student or reader of to-day. For example, one of the latest histories of Modern Europe, published in two volumes, with two companion volumes of sources and extracts from contemporary writers illustrating the text, although it contains two supplementary chapters of some eighty pages, on the last decade of European Politics and the World War, includes in a chapter near the close of the main part of the book a section with the most pathetic heading,—“Influences Favoring Universal Peace”, in which appears the statement that—

“While these peaceful influences may be overestimated, it is certain that people who are constantly mingling in the advance of science, invention and commerce become less and less inclined to warlike pursuits.”

This is the way we all thought in 1907, but we know better now. In Dr. Turner's work, on the contrary, the end is seen from the beginning, and the forces tending toward peace are not overestimated, nor are the conditions making for war minimized or overlooked, but all are seen in the full light of the actual results even when they were so slight as to have escaped earlier notice.

The logical arrangement of material, as well as the due proportion of details, is admirably maintained. The work is divided into two parts, of which the first part of about three hundred pages, brings the history down to 1871, with clear descriptions of “The Old Europe”, “The Separation of Communities in America”, “The French Revolution”, “Napoleon”, “The Industrial Revolution”, two chapters on “Great Britain”, “The Rise of Prussia and of Russia”, “The Unification of Italy”, and a closing chapter on “The Lesser Peoples”. The second and larger part, of about three hundred and fifty pages, is occupied

with the history of the last half-century, 1871-1920. We do not know where to find a fuller, more intelligent, more comprehensive yet compact treatment of this so important and so recent period. "The Growth of the New German Empire", beginning with 1867, is given in three chapters. Other chapters bear the suggestive and illuminating titles: "The Recovery of France", "Democratic Britain", "Colonies and Imperial Expansion", "The Triple Alliance and the Ententes", "The Causes of the Great War", "The Great War", "The Settlement of 1920", "The Russian Revolution", with two concluding chapters on "European Civilization Since the French Revolution", and "Social and Intellectual Changes", which are especially valuable for their keen insight, philosophic breadth of view, fine discrimination and comprehensive outlook.

The book has an introductory general bibliography and a detailed bibliography at the close of each of the twenty-eight chapters. It concludes with an appendix giving the names and dates of all the European rulers during the whole period, and a full analytical index. The book is admirably adapted to the use of the instructor in history, to the student or to the general reader. Its style is clear, concise and vigorous. It is free from abstract and technical treatment; it never descends to minute and unnecessary detail; yet it omits no important point bearing on the subject. It forms an exceptionally well-adapted text-book, for it gives the student a much better basis for study than he could get in the best record he could make of his instructor's lectures, and it affords the proficient instructor full scope for all the detailed exposition, illustration and deduction which his reading and reflection ought to furnish.

There are no distracting footnotes,—the text renders them unnecessary,—but the wide pages contain frequent marginal topics, and afford ample space for brief notes and comments by the advanced student and reader. While the book refers to the latest accessible historical atlases, it contains thirty-two full-page or double-page maps in convenient places for illustration of the text. All but two of them are in plain black and white and they contain only the most necessary names, so that one can, at a glance, receive a vivid impression of all the important features.

The mechanical features of the book, the large clear type, wide margins, and strong binding, are in harmony with the superiority of its content, are on a level with the best publishing achievements of to-day, and make the reading of the book a physical pleasure as well as an intellectual delight.

CHARLES L. WELLS.

THE WRITING OF HISTORY: AN INTRODUCTION TO HISTORICAL METHOD.

By Fred Morrow Fling, Professor of History in the University of Nebraska. New Haven: Yale University Press. 1920. Pp. 195.

8794
10113 This is a book of real practical and educational value. It is to be commended to every student of history, indeed to every reader of history, for by its aid he will know how to appreciate, to understand and to discriminate historical meanings and values.

It is full of suggestive material, but so condensed that it must be read to be appreciated. It shows all the steps of the process in the writing and understanding of history and points out the requirements from the sub-freshman stage to the art of Ranke and Mommsen.

One of the outstanding and useful features of the book is the attention given to definitions. Clear, concise and accurate, they add much to the value and effectiveness of the whole treatment of the subject.

The list of topics treated shows the scope and value of the work: "The Choice of a Subject"; "Collection, Classification, and Criticism of Sources"; "Establishment of the Facts"; "Synthesis or Grouping of the Facts"; "Exposition".

One of the most practical suggestions, which we wish every historical student and writer would take to heart, is the following:—

"To collect all the sources and submit each one to the tests that have been described for the genuineness, authorship, time and place of writing, and, finally, to compare them with each other in order to determine whether or not they are independent, is the task that consumes a vast amount of time and demands an equal amount of patient endeavor. In no other way, however, can history be scientifically written. The refusal to recognize this patent

fact and, at the same time, to fail to distinguish between popular and scientific historical expositions, has made the work of the scientific historian needlessly laborious. When an historian has carefully studied the sources of the period upon which he is engaged, the practice has been to treat the results of his critical studies as so much waste product after they have aided him in the construction of a scientific narrative. It is an indefensible practice. The same sources used for the construction of a study on one topic may be used later for the preparation of another topic taken from the same period. Why should the later investigator be obliged to repeat all the critical work accomplished by his predecessor, and why should this work still remain unformulated and the labor of Sisyphus go on forever? This by-product of the historian's labors should be preserved in an appendix, in footnotes, or published apart in an historical review."

A few more of the most striking topics may be indicated. First, the difference between history and science, both in fact and in method. Dr. Fling has given the best and most suggestive consideration we have read, and, we believe, has finally disposed of the vexed question of the preceding generation: Is History a Science? The distinction between history and any of the so-called Natural Sciences is clearly and logically stated. Second, the Investigation, Treatment and Criticism of sources. Third, Historical Method. Fourth, Historical Exposition. This last is perhaps the most suggestive and illuminating of all.

The value, as well as the interest, of the whole treatise, is greatly enhanced by the fact that it is based on the author's personal experience in a thorough, intensive study of the French Revolution, while the many examples and incidents drawn from that subject not only illustrate the writer's statements and illuminate the whole subject of reading and of writing history, but incidentally throw a great deal of light on the French Revolution itself.

The book is dedicated to Ernst Bernheim, the pioneer whose *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode* is the guide in the method of historical investigation for which this little book is a good introduction. There is a brief and well selected bibliography for each chapter.

The object of the book is well stated in the author's closing words:—

"I have attempted to make clear the difference between the method of history and that of natural science, and to justify the claim that some knowledge of historical method should form a part of the training of every educated man or woman, while a considerable acquaintance with the method should be required of every teacher of history. I have sought to demonstrate the necessity of developing the historical consciousness by the teaching of history in the schools, and of supplying a sound base for such instruction through scientific historical study. Finally, I have hoped to awaken in a few the laudable ambition to contribute something to the exact knowledge of man's past life in society through acquaintance with the methods of historical research and their conscious and careful application. If the book accomplishes one or more of these things, it will serve a good purpose."

CHARLES L. WELLS.

JOHN BURROUGHS—BOY AND MAN. By Clara Barrus. New York: Doubleday, Page and Company. 1920.

Few American writers have been more unfortunate in their critics than the late John Burroughs. Year after year American newspapers and their readers have patiently borne a monotonous succession of silly accounts of more or less silly pilgrimages to the succession of rustic dwellings of "Our John", as even Colonel Roosevelt called him. All of these accounts—and virtually everything else printed about Burroughs—were laudatory, oftenest worshipfully laudatory, and more and more, as John Burroughs advanced in years and turned from his early poetic delight in nature to philosophic speculation of the non-technical sort, those who wrote about him regarded him as a modern sage, a wise man of the ages actually living in our own time, and in materialistic America—our own wise John. The climax of this adulation was reached by Dr. Clara Barrus, a close friend, in a book published a year or two ago entitled *Our Friend John Burroughs*, a preposterously shapeless book in which the plainest matters of fact in the Burroughs household became fraught with the

deepest philosophic import, and in which the constant endeavor to be light and jocose only emphasized the author's total lack of the saving grace of humor. And now the material of that book has been re-presented in a volume primarily intended for boys but naïvely said to be equally adapted to adults. It would perhaps be unkind but true to say that it *is* adapted to the boy reader, while the earlier book is adapted to adults who have never had the good fortune to grow up. Happily the new book, like the old, is concerned chiefly, not with the pseudo-sage, but with the boy and young man John Burroughs. "Some persons always skip the parts of a biography that tell about the ancestors, but since boys like to hear about bears, why not a little about forebears?" And so we get a little about Burroughs's very interesting forebears, from whom he plainly derived much of his strength and his weakness, and then a great deal (nearly a dozen chapters) about his early life on the Catskill farm, and his inadequate schooling, and his "working for Uncle Sam" in Washington where Walt Whitman started him on his career as an interpreter of life; and a few more chapters on the mature John Burroughs "at work and play" (the two not clearly differentiated). In all this there is much to inspire the young reader, though a certain softness of moral fibre, which Burroughs himself complacently recognized, made him an insufficient model for young America—more seriously insufficient than the heroic John Muir.

John Burroughs's story, like John Muir's, remains to be told by a well-equipped biographer, a biographer prepared to estimate the several sides of this popular essayist—scientific, literary, and philosophic. If such a critical biographer can be found, it is safe to predict that he will make short work of the somewhat flaccid philosophic musings of the later John Burroughs, give slight praise to his scientific achievement, and value highest his early essays, written in the Washington days, in which Burroughs contented himself with continuing worthily the tradition of sympathetic description of nature established in American letters by Henry Thoreau.

NORMAN FOERSTER.

Oxford, England.

EDGAR ALLAN POE: HOW TO KNOW HIM. By C. Alphonso Smith. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company. 1921. Pp. 350.

RALPH WALDO EMERSON: HOW TO KNOW HIM. By Samuel McChord Crothers. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company. 1921. Pp. 234.

Professor Smith has given us a very readable review of Poe as critic, poet, short-story writer, and "frontiersman", by which last term is meant explorer of "those vast borderlands of speculation in which vision and intuition tread with firmer footing than smug logic or traditional philosophy". To each of these chapters is prefixed a stimulating introduction, following which come well-chosen illustrative specimens, in accordance with the plan of the series, of Poe's work in kind, with editorial aids and comments. The first chapter, after outlining his life, presents briefly but capably several of the more important foreign and domestic judgments concerning Poe's place and influence, and the succeeding chapter sympathetically examines his character. Professor Smith's estimates of Poe's work show at times a slight bias occasioned by purely personal enthusiasm, but this does not in itself invalidate the appraisals here registered. After all, imaginative sympathy is what we chiefly need in constructive criticism. His defence of Poe as an artist of the beautiful and his belief that Poe was indebted to the old communal ballad for some of his repetitive effects are well expressed, and his constant emphasis upon Poe's interest in technique and structure is sound.

Certainly, within the limits of his restricted poetic programme, Poe is lord. The solemn eeriness of his atmospheres—their qualities of reminiscence, portent, spirit-lure; the haunting cadences of his woe-burdened refrains; the subtle hintings of his whispered repetitions; the shadowy glidings of his alliterations and assonances—all these confirm him an artist in the words and silences that make for the beauty of night and dream and death. But we think it a mistake to continue to include *The Raven* among the truest poems of Poe, with its somewhat theatrically grotesque color-scheme, its over-reliance upon the tinkle of the word, and its lapses into triteness in lines 21, 34, 51 and 60.

Not only does Professor Smith's book exemplify the value of the series of which it is a member, but, even if some of its judg-

ments are too generously defensive, it is a real contribution to the criticism of Poe.

Dr. Samuel M. Crothers writes of Emerson *con amore*,—as a Bostonian, a Unitarian and a man of letters of a Bostonian, a Unitarian and a man of letters. In twenty-two short chapters he discusses, with many reinforcing quotations, the chief qualities of Emerson's character, mind, manner, and attitude toward nature, science, politics, friendship, poverty, peace and war, and also his affectionate but frankly discriminating analyses of American and English qualities.

Perhaps the most illuminating sentence in a humane and delightful book is the following: "Emerson was a man thinking", an adaptation of Emerson's declaration in his address—*The American Scholar*—delivered before the Phi Beta Kappa Society at Harvard in 1837, that—

"Man is not a farmer, or a professor, or an engineer, but he is all. Man is priest, and scholar, and statesman, and producer, and soldier. . . . In this distribution of functions, the scholar is the delegated intellect. In the right state he is *Man Thinking*."

The appreciation of Emerson as a poet in this volume lags behind the enthusiasm displayed for his gentle but sturdy wisdom as lecturer and essayist. For ourselves, although the essays impress us less as 'treatments' than as adventurous eloquences, whose purpose it is to pursue high thoughts for pure love of the chase and zest for the untakable quarry, we think it not improbable that many students of Emerson may sooner or later come to prefer the poems, as having the same tonic earnestness as the essays, the same Quakerish dignity of diction, at times felicitously if almost absent-mindedly whimsical, yet possessing more immediacy, more totality, as chants of single-fibred being and rare but for the most part passionless music. In both there are a quality of reminiscence and a quality of vision that make them literature. They are not little and local, but large and for all.

We regret that this fine interpretation of Emerson's spirit does not contain footnotes identifying for the beginner in Emerson each of the passages so appositely presented. G. H. C.

THE SCHOOLMISTRESS, AND OTHER STORIES. By Anton Chekhov. Translated by Constance Garrett. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1921. Pp. 305.

THE SEVEN WIVES OF BLUEBEARD, AND OTHER MARVELLOUS TALES. By Anatole France. Translated by D. B. Stewart. New York: John Lane Company. 1921. Pp. 217.

DEVIL STORIES: AN ANTHOLOGY. Selected and Edited, with Introduction and Critical Comments, by Maximilian J. Rudwin. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1921. Pp. 332.

A CHAIR ON THE BOULEVARD. By Leonard Merrick, with an Introduction by A. Neil Lyons. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 1921. Pp. 390.

That the short-story (we agree with Professor Brander Matthews about the hyphen) is a true type of literature, distinct from any other, is an article of critical faith, but students of the *genre* still continue to differ concerning its indispensable qualities. Certainly, these are often confounded with frequently recurring characteristics that are not, however, *native* to the short-story. Among the necessary qualities we should be disposed to recognize conscious singleness of aim, atmosphere, movement and impression; swift, dynamic characterization; a simple plot built up by from one to six or seven people; and a tingeing or coloring of the whole fabric by the unusual personality of its maker. Indeed, we should try to define the type in some such fashion as the following: The short-story is a form of fiction differing from the novel in that it impressionistically relates, harmoniously tones, and quickly develops toward a logically necessary outcome a planned interlinking of events, inner or outer, having immediate totality of effect.

The short-story, of course, is more variously motivated than the novel can be. A novel based exclusively upon the humorous intention, for example, cannot escape failure as a novel, whatever success of another kind it may achieve: witness *Pickwick Papers* and Compton Mackenzie's *Poor Relations*. But the short-story may be wholly humorous, or tragic, or romantic, or idyllic, or ingenious, or supernatural, or parabolic, or fantastic, or psychological. The four books before us exemplify well the elasticity of its range, in the sombre sympathies of Chekhov, the delicate drollery of France, the whimsical (sometimes tragic) supernaturalism of Rudwin's anthology, and the lively Parisian yarns of Merrick.

Realistic irony, touched by stoic fortitude and a comrade-like compassion, is the prevailing note in the great Russian's work, fictional and dramatic alike. Chekhov's little gray-toned stories show astonishing awareness of motives, of the significance of slight things, and are imbued with that sincere artistic melancholy (the melancholy of the tragic side of art) which seems to touch even laughter into something relatively hushed and momentary. The dovetailings, symbolizings and anticipative hints are finely done, especially, perhaps, in the title-story, *A Nervous Breakdown*, *Misery*, *After the Theatre*, *A Lady's Story*, *In Exile*, *On Official Duty*, *The Head Gardener's Story* (which has already appeared in an English translation and which is an important contribution to art's pronouncement upon penology), *The Bet*, *A Transgression*, and *The Cattle-Dealers*.

In his novel, *A Dreary Story*, Chekhov compares at some length Russian and French literatures. He does not find in contemporary Russian literature a satisfactory equilibrium of talent, cleverness and a good tone. All three, at their best, appear in the work of Anatole France at his best. Certainly, *Le Crime de Sylvestre Bonnard* was justly crowned,—a beautiful, moving review of a scholar's gentle soul. The present book is less appealing, although, of course, we must not judge it for what it neither aspires nor pretends to be. It contains three diverting short-stories and a novelette in fourteen chapters, and is the most recent addition to the English translation of France's works edited by the late Frederic Chapman and James Lewis May. The title-story is the most amusing and ingenious, being an attempt ("from authentic documents") to free the memory of Bernard de Montragoux (the Bluebeard of the nursery) from the odious reputation given him by Charles Perrault. As in the case of the two tales succeeding it—*The Miracle of the Great St. Nicolas* and *The Story of the Duchess of Cicogne and of Monsieur de Boulengrin*, the division into chapters is merely deviceful, not necessary. As against Chekhov, the tone here, although satisfactorily 'good' in the sense of being true to its own purpose, is that of romantic irony.

Mr. Rudwin's anthology contains twenty stories of diabolism chosen from the works of such men as Machiavelli, Irving, Hauff, Gogol, Thackeray, Poe, Caballero, Baudelaire, Daudet, de Mau-

passant, Garnett, Anatole France, Gorky and Masfield. The translations are, in general, adequate, and the editorial introduction and notes balance the felicity of the selection. Mr. Rudwin, a Polish-American, is a specialist in the literature of the subject, having written several works dealing with the Devil in the German religious plays of the Middle Ages and the Reformation, and with the Devil in modern French literature. He is also editing other anthologies of like character to include Devil Plays, Devil Essays, Devil Legends, the story of Lilith, Satanic verse and *Bibliographia Diabolica*. The intention is to provide "a sort of portrait-gallery of the literary delineations of Satan" in many times and countries.

That Mr. Lyons, himself a first-rate humorist, should find so much to praise in Leonard Merrick's *A Chair on the Boulevard* is significant of its value, despite the too great generosity of the former's words. There is not a dull story in this book. Each is roguishly absurd or winsomely human, or both, and Mr. Merrick is wise enough, after winning for the poet, Gustave Tricotrin, and his friend the composer, Nicolas Pitou (of *While Paris Laughed*), the regard of those who have not previously met them, to tie together these twenty stories—filled with the provisional exultations and despairs of irresponsible youth—as loosely connected episodes in the careers of the lovable poet and his comrade. Behind and about all, are Paris and Montmartre and the spirit of adventure, with its devastating emotions and its romantic resilience.

G. H. C.

THE STYLE AND LITERARY METHOD OF LUKE. By Henry J. Cadbury, Lecturer in the New Testament, Andover Theological Seminary. Harvard Theological Studies, Number VI. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1920. Pp. vii, 205.

This is an exceedingly valuable and interesting section of the large subject of the Lukan authorship of the third Gospel and of the Acts, and of the general considerations which are connected with that subject. It gives evidence on every page of a minutely critical scholarship, limited, however, to, and based upon, a keen, thorough and comprehensive verbal analysis.

Few conclusions are offered, as is fitting, and there is, naturally, little that appeals to the general reader, although it contains a

great deal of valuable information and suggestion for the critical student.

The book is in two parts, at first published separately, but now issued in one volume. The first part deals with the diction of the third Gospel and Acts, and includes a lengthy scholarly treatment of "The Alleged Medical Language of Luke" with a criticism of Hobart, Harnack and Zahn, and including a Note on the History of the Discussion by Dr. G. F. Moore.

Special attention is due to the writer's criticism of the theory that Luke was a physician, so far as that theory rests upon the medical language used by Luke. This criticism is based upon a critical analysis of the so-called medical terms, and is made more significant by an exhaustive comparison of Luke's language with Lucian, in criticism of Hobart's comparison. The author concludes:—

"In comparing the language of Luke with the corresponding expressions in Mark or Matthew, the fact that the term in Luke is found in the medical writers does not prove that he is a physician, for a well educated person such as Luke evidently was, even without special medical training would use more technical terms than a less educated person. The general difference between Luke and the other synoptists is shown elsewhere to be a marked difference in culture."

Dr. Cadbury's section on Luke's treatment of his sources is an interesting and valuable part of his work.

"The general accuracy", he concludes, "that we may presume of all the New Testament text is an additional advantage possessed by the comparison of Mark and Luke over the comparison of any other two ancient books outside the New Testament, either or both of which rest on less trustworthy textual tradition."

This treatise is a good piece of work. It is intended, of course, to be only philological. Yet some interesting questions are omitted. In criticising Luke's use of Mark the author might have compared Matthew's use of Mark. Did Luke have an Aramaic source, either in Mark or in other sources? Where did Luke get his Herodian material? Are not the changes in Luke due to the difference of his object? He was writing to

Theophilus, a Greek, or one representing the Greek; his Gospel was not for the Jews: *e. g.*, he does not use 'Rabbi' but 'Epistates' or 'Didaskolos'.

The brief preface contains some statements worthy of note. After calling attention to the new light thrown on the New Testament Greek by the recent discovery of an immense number of papyri, showing that the Greek of the New Testament was the common Greek vernacular of the period and in general use throughout the Roman Empire, the writer states two assumptions, which he adopts, and which are all but universally accepted by scholars: First, that the third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles were the work of the same author, approximately in their present form; second, that the Gospel of Luke is based upon a Greek source, substantially identical with our Mark, and also upon further Greek memorabilia (commonly called Q) both of which were also used by Matthew. These two assumptions are very significant as the final conclusion of the most searching analytical criticism extending over a century and a half.

The name of the author of the Gospel and Acts has been left an open question, although the Lukan authorship is now generally accepted; at any rate, there are no very strong arguments against it.

CHARLES L. WELLS.

FROM A FLAT HOUSTOP. By Charlotte Hardin. Boston: The Four Seas Company. 1920. Pp. 67.

THE WIND OVER THE WATER. By Philip Merivale. Boston: The Four Seas Company. 1920. Pp. 50.

MOODS OF MANHATTAN. By Louise Mallinckrodt Kueffner. New York: The Modernist Press. 1920. Pp. 61.

None of these three slight volumes constitutes or even contains a contribution to poetry. The first, although it seems conditioned by not inadequate emotional moods, lacks the adequate voice: its reed is thin, uncertain. The second is a one-act play written in blank verse, and laid in the Iceland of the twelfth century. It has a smooth grace and a symbolic suggestiveness touching the mysteries of change; but stylistic propriety is not a synonym for authentic power. The third is a grotesquely unsuccessful effort to uphold the banner of the Imagists.